arXiv:1610.09764v1 [math.SG] 31 Oct 2016

GLUING AFFINE VORTICES

GUANGBO XU

Abstract

We provide an analytical construction of the gluing map for stable affine vortices over the upper half plane with the Lagrangian boundary condition.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Degeneration of Affine Vortices 4
3. Gluing I: Statement 8
4. Gluing II: Preparation 14
5. Gluing III: Construction 29
Appendix A. Technical Results about Vortices 50
Appendix B. Technical Results about Adiabatic Limits 50
Appendix C. Derivatives of the Exponential Map 56
References 57

1. Introduction

Vortices are local minima of the Yang-Mills-Higgs functional. For example, given a Hermitian line bundle L over a compact Riemann surface Σ, for a unitary connection $A \in \mathscr{A}(L)$ and a smooth section $u \in \Gamma(L)$, the Yang-Mills-Higgs functional reads

$$\mathscr{YMH}(A,u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Sigma \Big[|d_A u|^2 + \frac{1}{4\epsilon^2}(|u|^2-1)^2 + \epsilon^2|F_A|^2\Big]\mathrm{dvol}_\Sigma,\ (\epsilon>0)$$

and the vortex equation, which is the equation of motion for this functional, reads

$$\overline{\partial}_A u = 0, \qquad *F_A - \frac{\boldsymbol{i}}{2\epsilon^2}(|u|^2-1) = 0. \tag{1.1}$$

The vortex equation appears in many areas of mathematics and physics, and has been generalized to the case of nonabelian gauge groups and nonlinear target spaces.

Vortices share many similar features with J-holomorphic curves. So it is natural to use vortices to define numerical invariants (similar to Gromov-Witten invariants) for a symplectic manifold X with a Hamiltonian action by a compact Lie group K. In this setting the equation is also called the "symplectic vortex equation," which was firstly considered by [9] [3] [10]. Moreover, such invariants (see for example [2] [10] [11]) is closely related to the ordinary Gromov-Witten invariants of the symplectic quotient $\bar{X} = X/\!\!/K$.

Date: November 1, 2016.

This relation is unveiled by looking at the "adiabatic limit" of the symplectic vortex equation (i.e., $\epsilon \to 0$ in (1.1)). The first mathematical discussion of adiabatic limit of the symplectic vortex equation and the relation between the gauged invariants of X and the Gromov-Witten invariants of $\bar{X}$ was given in [6]. In principle, using the symplectic vortex equation one can also define other symplectic invariants of a Hamiltonian K-manifold, for example, gauged Floer homology (see [5] [25]). Such invariants are related to their counterparts of $\bar{X}$ defined by J-holomorphic curves, via the $\epsilon \to 0$ adiabatic limit.

One cannot expect the invariants for X and $\bar{X}$ are trivially identified. This is because in the adiabatic limit process, vortices converge to J-holomorphic curves modulo "affine vortex" bubbles. The affine vortices are solutions to the vortex equation over $\mathbb{C}$. Different from the bubbling phenomena in J-holomorphic curve theory or Donaldson theory, the bubbling of affine vortices can be regarded as a "codimension zero phenomenon." This is because the affine vortex equation has only translation invariance but not conformal invariance. Therefore, the invariants for X and $\bar{X}$ are identified only after a "coordinate transformation" defined by counting affine vortices. Such coordinate transformation is often referred to as the "quantum Kirwan map," which is a deformation of the classical Kirwan map $H^*_K(X) \to H^*(\bar{X})$. For Gromov-Witten theory, the principle of the quantum Kirwan map has been explained in [28] [12] [21]. In the case that X is a projective manifold and the K-action extends to an algebraic action by $K^{\mathbb{C}}$, the quantum Kirwan map is constructed in [21].

In the presence of Lagrangian submanifolds, in the adiabatic limit, there also appear affine vortices over the upper half plane $\mathbb{H}$. This is again a codimension zero phenomenon, which leads to a nontrivial relation between "open-string invariants" of Lagrangian submanifolds. This idea was firstly brought in by Woodward [20] and a precisely stated conjecture along this line can be found in the introduction of [16]. This is the main motivation for the current paper and for the project on the "open quantum Kirwan map" of the author with Woodward, which will appear in [22].

In the symplectic setting, in order to define the (open or closed) quantum Kirwan map by virtual integration over the moduli space and in order to prove its properties, one has to understand its compactification and the associated gluing. A Gromov type compactification of affine vortex moduli has been constructed in [28] for the closed case, and the open case is essentially covered by the main theorem of [16]. Compared to pseudoholomorphic curves, affine vortices have more involved types of degenerations. Energy concentration does cause bubbling of holomorphic spheres or disks, similar to pseudoholomorphic curves. Besides, the energy can also be separated to regions that are arbitrarily far away (with respect to the Euclidean metric), or escape from infinity.

In this paper we construct the gluing map for stable $\mathbb{H}$-vortices. We do not consider the most general configurations of stable affine vortices, but only those which consist of several affine vortex components connected by a single disk component. Such a configuration is illustrated in Figure 1, which we call a "simple" configuration (see Section 3). We also add marked points to stabilize the domains. We remark that this special case

is the only new piece which has not been understood and this special case is enough for the application in [22]; moreover, the analysis can also be easily generalized to the most general case, and can be used to construct any type of "virtual local chart."

Our main theorem is the following, whose precise version is Theorem 3.10.

Theorem 1.1. *Let (X, ω_X, μ) be a Hamiltonian K-manifold equipped with a K-invariant, ω_X-compatible almost complex structure. Assume that the symplectic quotient $\bar{X} = \mu^{-1}(0)/K$ is a compact free quotient. Let $L \subset X$ be a K invariant embedded Lagrangian submanifold which is contained in $\mu^{-1}(0)$.*

Let $l, \underline{l} \geqslant 0$, $l + \underline{l} \geqslant 1$. Let $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{l,\underline{l}}(X, L)$ be the moduli space of gauge equivalence classes of perturbed stable affine vortices over $\mathbb{H}$ with l interior marked points and $\underline{l}$ boundary marked points, equipped with a natural topology. Let Δ be a simple combinatorial type, which labels a stratum $\mathcal{M}_\Delta(X, L) \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{l,\underline{l}}(X, L)$. Here the perturbation is parametrized by an open subset of a finite dimensional real vector space W.

Given a point $[\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}] \in \mathcal{M}_\Delta(X, L)$, under certain transversality assumption, there exist an open neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_\Delta(X, L) \subset \mathcal{M}_\Delta(X, L)$ of $[\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}]$, an $\epsilon_0 > 0$, and a continuous map

$$\mathcal{GLUE} : \mathcal{U}_\Delta(X, L) \times [0, \epsilon_0) \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{l,\underline{l}}(X, L)$$

which is a homeomorphism onto its image.



FIGURE 1. The degeneration of affine vortices over $\mathbb{H}$ towards a simple stable affine vortex. The picture on the left can also represent the degeneration of solutions to other types of equations satisfying translation invariance and energy quantization property.

One of the technical difficulties in the analytical study of affine vortices is their mixed geometric behaviors. In a region with large area, the image of u is close to the level set $\mu^{-1}(0)$, where the tangent bundle TX splits into $H_X \oplus G_X$. Here G_X is the direction of group action, and H_X is roughly the tangent bundle of the symplectic quotient. In the H_X direction u is close to a holomorphic curve while the behavior in the G_X direction is different. Therefore, especially for gluing, one has to be very careful in choosing the weighted Sobolev norms which match the behaviors in the two orthogonal directions.

Another difficulty is due to the noncompactness of the domain; although there has been a great amount of details for adiabatic limit over compact Riemann surfaces in [6], we have to extend almost everything to the noncompact setting in this paper.

1.1. **Extensions and applications.** As we have explained, the immediate motivation for studying the gluing of affine vortices is from the project of the author with Woodward [22], which aims at defining an "open quantum Kirwan map," which relates the "quasimap Fukaya algebra" of a K-invariant Lagrangian submanifold $L \subset X$ with the ordinary Fukaya algebra of the induced Lagrangian $\bar{L} \subset \bar{X}$. The more precise statement and potential applications were explained in the introduction of [16].

Moreover, using the technique and analytical setting of this paper, one can construct the gluing map for affine vortices over $\mathbb{C}$, and the gluing map with respect to the adiabatic limit. This would be an important step towards the resolution of Salamon's quantum Kirwan map conjecture in the symplectic setting, initiated in [26] [28].

In symplectic geometry and gauge theory there are other types of objects which are translation invariant rather than conformal invariant. The figure 8 bubble, appeared in the strip shrinking limits of pseudoholomorphic quilts (see [18] [19] [1]), is such an example. There are also infinite dimensional examples, such as the anti-self-dual equation over $\mathbb{C} \times \Sigma$ (see [17]). We hope that the technique of this paper can be used in the gluing construction for other translation invariant equations.

1.2. **Acknowledgements.** I am greatly indebted to Professor Chris Woodward, who shares numerous interesting ideas with the author. I would also like to thank Professor Gang Tian for long time support and encouragement, and thank Dr. Sushmita Venugopalan for helpful discussions about vortices.

2. Degeneration of Affine Vortices

In this section we review the basic (mostly non-analytical) knowledge about affine vortices, holomorphic curves in symplectic quotients, and explain how affine vortices can degenerate through two examples.

2.1. **Preliminaries on affine vortices.** We first recall the basic knowledge of affine vortices. For the original idea on their relation with the adiabatic limit, see [6], [28].

Let K be a compact Lie group, with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{k}$ and complexification G. Let (X, ω_X) be a symplectic manifold. Assume there is a Hamiltonian K-action on (X, ω_X), with a moment map

$$\mu : X \to \mathfrak{k}^*.$$

Choose once and for all an Ad-invariant metric on $\mathfrak{k}$, so μ is viewed as $\mathfrak{k}$-valued. For $a \in \mathfrak{k}$, let $\mathcal{X}_a \in \Gamma(TX)$ be the associated infinitesimal action. Our convention is that $a \mapsto -\mathcal{X}_a$ is a Lie algebra homomorphism.

We make the following fundamental assumption.

Hypothesis 2.1. $0 \in \mathfrak{k}$ is a regular value of μ and the symplectic quotient $\bar{X} := \mu^{-1}(0)/K$ is a free quotient.

Let J_X be a K-invariant, ω-compatible almost complex structure. Then $g_X(\cdot,\cdot) := \omega_X(\cdot, J_X\cdot)$ is a Riemannian metric. We fix a K-invariant neighborhood U_X of $\mu^{-1}(0)$ such that K acts freely on U_X. Let $G_X \subset TX|_{U_X}$ be the distribution spanned by $\mathfrak{X}_a$ and $J_X\mathfrak{X}_a$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{k}$.

Let $L \subset X$ be an embedded K-invariant Lagrangian submanifold that is contained in $\mu^{-1}(0)$. Then $\bar{L} := L/K$ is an embedded Lagrangian submanifold of $\bar{X}$. We need a special type of Riemannian metric which does not necessarily coincide with g_X.

Lemma 2.2. [16, Lemma A.3] *There exists a (J_X, L, μ)-admissible Riemannian metric h_X on X, i.e.,*

(a) h_X is K-invariant.
(b) J_X is h_X-isometric.
(c) $J_X(TL)$ is orthogonal to TL with respect to h_X.
(d) $T\mu^{-1}(0)$ is orthogonal to $J_X\mathfrak{X}_a$ with respect to h_X, for all $a \in \mathfrak{k}$.
(e) L is totally geodesic with respect to the Levi-Civita connection of h_X.

Let H_X be the h_X-orthogonal complement of G_X. Then $TX|_{U_X} = H_X \oplus G_X$ is a K-invariant splitting. Item (b) above implies that H_X is J_X-invariant; Item (d) above implies that $H_X|_{\mu^{-1}(0)} \subset T\mu^{-1}(0)$. It is also easy to see that $H_X|_{\mu^{-1}(0)}$ is the g_X-orthogonal complement of $G_X|_{\mu^{-1}(0)}$. Hence $H_X|_{\mu^{-1}(0)}$ is independent of the choice of h_X. It defines a connection on the K-bundle $\mu^{-1}(0)$.

Let us fix such a metric h_X. If one only considers gluing closed affine vortices, then $h_X = g_X$ suffices to carry out all the analysis of this paper.

Remark 2.3. Usually one imposes conditions on (X, ω_X) to ensure compactness of moduli spaces. The compactness property is not used in constructing the gluing map.

Let $\mathbb{A}$ be either $\mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{H}$, which is equipped with the standard complex structure and the standard translation invariant metric. We use Ω to denote an open subset of $\mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{H}$. Let $z = s + \boldsymbol{i}t$ be the standard coordinate.

Definition 2.4. (a) A smooth gauged map from Ω to X is a smooth map $\mathbf{v} = (u, \phi, \psi) : \Sigma \to X \times \mathfrak{k} \times \mathfrak{k}$. We often identify the triple (u, ϕ, ψ) with a pair (u, a) where $a = \phi ds + \psi dt \in \Omega^1(\Omega, \mathfrak{k})$, and still abbreviate the pair by $\mathbf{v}$.

(b) Given a smooth gauged map $\mathbf{v} = (u, \phi, \psi)$, we denote

$$\mathbf{v}_s = \partial_s u + \mathfrak{X}_\phi(u), \ \ \mathbf{v}_t = \partial_t u + \mathfrak{X}_\psi(u).$$

(c) Let $\sigma : \Omega \to (0, +\infty)$ be a smooth function. We denote by $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}}(\Omega, \sigma; X, L)$ the set of smooth solutions $\mathbf{v} = (u, \phi, \psi)$ to the equation

$$\mathbf{v}_s + J_X\mathbf{v}_t = 0, \ \ \partial_s\psi - \partial_t\phi + [\phi, \psi] + \sigma\mu(u) = 0, \ \ u(\partial\Omega) \subset L. \tag{2.1}$$

When $\partial\Omega = \varnothing$, we abbreviate the set by $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}}(\Omega, \sigma; X)$; when $\sigma = 1$, abbreviate as $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}}(\Omega; X, L)$ or $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}}(\Omega; X)$.

(d) An **affine vortex** over $\mathbb{C}$ (usually called a $\mathbb{C}$-vortex) is an element of $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}}(\mathbb{C}; X)$, i.e., smooth solutions $\mathbf{v} = (u, \phi, \psi) : \mathbb{C} \to X \times \mathfrak{k} \times \mathfrak{k}$ to the affine vortex equation

$$\partial_s u + \mathfrak{X}_\phi(u) + J_X(\partial_t u + \mathfrak{X}_\psi(u)) = 0,\ \partial_s \psi - \partial_t \phi + [\phi, \psi] + \mu(u) = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

(Later we will consider a perturbed equation.) We require the "boundedness" condition, meaning that $u(\mathbb{C})$ has compact closure in X and has finite energy, i.e., the quantity

$$E(\mathbf{v}) := \frac{1}{2}\Big[\|\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mathbf{v}_t\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\partial_s\psi - \partial_t\phi + [\phi, \psi]\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\mu(u)\|_{L^2}^2\Big]$$

is finite.

(e) An $\mathbb{H}$-vortex in (X, L) ($\mathbb{H}$-vortex for short) is an element of $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}}(\mathbb{H}; X, L)$.

Remark 2.5. (a) Equation (2.1) is a special case of the symplectic vortex equation introduced by Mundet [9] [10] and Cieliebak-Gaio-Salamon [3], which can be written in a coordinate-free way over a general Riemann surface Σ, where the variables are connections of a K-bundle over Σ and sections of the associated fibre bundle. In this paper, we only consider affine vortices and skip the coordinate-free treatment.

(b) Vortices with Lagrangian boundary conditions are also studied in [23] for $K = S^1$, and in [5] for different types of Lagrangians (not K-invariant).

Equation (2.1) has a gauge symmetry. If $\mathbf{v} = (u, \phi, \psi)$ is an $\mathbb{A}$-vortex and $\mathscr{k} : \mathbb{A} \to K$ is a gauge transformation, then

$$\mathscr{k} \cdot \mathbf{v} := \Big(\mathscr{k} \cdot u,\ \mathrm{Ad}_{\mathscr{k}}(\phi) - (\partial_s \mathscr{k})\mathscr{k}^{-1},\ \mathrm{Ad}_{\mathscr{k}}(\psi) - (\partial_t \mathscr{k})\mathscr{k}^{-1}\Big).$$

is also an $\mathbb{A}$-vortex and we say the two affine vortices are gauge equivalent. Notice that here the notation indicates that this is a left action.

There is also a translation symmetry of (2.2). Suppose $\mathbf{v} = (u, \phi, \psi)$ is an $\mathbb{A}$-vortex. There is a group of translations isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}$, such that for any $\mathtt{t} \in \mathbb{A}$, $\mathtt{t} \cdot \mathbf{v} := (u \circ \mathtt{t}, \phi \circ \mathtt{t}, \psi \circ \mathtt{t})$ is also an $\mathbb{A}$-vortex. We regard $\mathtt{t} \cdot \mathbf{v}$ being equivalent to $\mathbf{v}$.

2.2. **Holomorphic curves in the quotient.** In general, for a Riemann surface C, a more general type of gauged map is a triple (P, A, u), where $P \to C$ is a K-bundle, $A \in \mathscr{A}(P)$ and $u \in \Gamma(P \times_K X)$. If P is trivialized and C has coordinate $z = s + \boldsymbol{i}t$, we can write $A = d + \phi ds + \psi dt$. In this case it coincides with our previous definition.

One can also use gauged maps to represent holomorphic curves in the quotient $\bar{X}$. For simplicity consider the case that C is a contractible subset of $\mathbb{H}$ or $\mathbb{C}$. Suppose $\bar{u} : C \to \bar{X}$ is a C^1-map satisfying the equation

$$\overline{\partial}_{J_{\bar{X}}} \bar{u} = 0,\ \bar{u}(\partial C) \subset \bar{L}.$$

Here $J_{\bar{X}}$ is the induced almost complex structure on $\bar{X}$. Then one can pull back the K-bundle $\mu^{-1}(0) \to \bar{X}$ as well as the connection determined by the horizontal distribution

$H_X|_{\mu^{-1}(0)}$. This gives a bundle $P \to C$ and a connection $A \in \mathscr{A}(P)$. $\bar{u}$ also lifts to a section of $P \times_K X$. Since C is contractible, one can trivialize P so that A is written as $A = d + \phi ds + \psi dt$ and u is a genuine map $u : C \to \mu^{-1}(0)$. This gives us a gauged map $\mathbf{v} = (u, \phi, \psi)$. Moreover, if $\bar{u}$ is $J_{\bar{X}}$-holomorphic, then $\mathbf{v}$ satisfies the equation

$$\partial_s u + \mathfrak{X}_\phi + J_X(\partial_t u + \mathfrak{X}_\psi) = 0,\ \mu(u) = 0,\ u(\partial C) \subset L. \tag{2.3}$$

Different trivializations of the pull-back bundle $P \to C$ give gauge equivalent solutions to (2.3). On the other hand, each gauge equivalence class of solutions of (2.3) projects down to a $J_{\bar{X}}$-holomorphic map into $\bar{X}$.

We would like to remark that, if we view both u and (ϕ, ψ) as independent variables of (2.3), then it is not elliptic. The correct perspective is to regard ϕ and ψ as components of the pullback connection, so only u is the independent variable of (2.3). Then the G_X-component of (2.3) is automatically satisfied and (2.3) is equivalent to

$$P_H\Big(\partial_s u + \mathfrak{X}_\phi + J_X(\partial_t u + \mathfrak{X}_\psi)\Big) = 0,\ \mu(u) = 0,\ u(\partial C) \subset L. \tag{2.4}$$

where $P_H : H_X \oplus G_X \to H_X$ is the projection onto the first factor.

From now on we take the gauged map viewpoint of holomorphic curves in $\bar{X}$. In particular, if $\bar{u}$ is a holomorphic disk in $\bar{X}$ with boundary in $\bar{L}$, then we view it as a map $\bar{u} : (\mathbb{H}, \partial\mathbb{H}) \to (\bar{X}, \bar{L})$ with removable singularity at infinity, so can be lifted to a gauge equivalence classes of solutions to (2.3) with $C = \mathbb{H}$. From now on, in this paper, we will use these two perspectives interchangeably.

2.3. **Examples.** We provide a few examples on extremal cases of the degeneration for $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{C}$. One can also construct similar examples for $\mathbb{H}$-vortices but the following ones are sufficient to show an intuitive idea.

2.3.1. *Example 1.* Consider a sequence of monic polynomials of degree $d \geqslant 2$

$$f_i(z) = (z - z_i^1) \cdots (z - z_i^d).$$

By Taubes' theorem (see [13], [7]), there are unique solutions $h_i : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ to the equation

$$-\frac{\Delta h_i}{2\pi} + \frac{1}{2}\left(e^{2h_i}|f_i(z)|^2 - 1\right) = 0$$

with an appropriate asymptotic constrain on h_i. Equivalently, $(e^{h_i} f_i, -\partial_t h_i, \partial_s h_i)$ is an affine vortex with target $\mathbb{C}$. Furthermore, this correspondence gives a homeomorphism

$$\mathscr{M}(\mathbb{C}; \mathbb{C}) \simeq \bigsqcup_{d \geqslant 0} \mathrm{Sym}^d \mathbb{C}.$$

Let us now moving the zeroes. Suppose there is a partition $\{1, \ldots, d\} = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_s$ by nonempty subsets, such that, as $i \to \infty$, $|z_i^\alpha - z_i^\beta|$ is bounded (resp. unbounded) when α, β belong to the same (resp. different) subsets of this partition. Then up to choosing a subsequence, one can show that the corresponding sequence of affine vortices will degenerate to a stable affine vortex having exactly s affine vortex components. Moreover,

if the zeroes of f^i of different groups separate from each other in relatively the same rate, then the limit will be a simple[1] stable affine vortex.

2.3.2. *Example 2.* Consider abelian vortices of higher rank. Consider a sequence $\vec{f_i}$, each of which is an N-tuple of polynomials

$$\vec{f_i} = (f_i^1, \dots, f_i^N),\ \max_\alpha\{\deg f_i^\alpha\} = d \geqslant 1.$$

Then by the main theorem of [24] (see also [14]), there exists a unique solution $h_i : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R}$ to the equation

$$-\frac{\Delta h_i}{2\pi} + \frac{1}{2}\left(e^{2h_i}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{N}|f_i^\alpha(z)|^2 - 1\right) = 0.$$

So such an N-tuple of polynomials corresponds to an affine vortex with target $\mathbb{C}^N$ and gauge group $K = S^1$.

For simplicity restrict to the special case that $N = 2$, $d = 1$ and

$$f_i^1(z) = z - n_i,\ f_i^2(z) = z;\ n_i \to \infty.$$

For the corresponding sequence of affine vortices in $\mathbb{C}^2$, one can argue that in the limit, there is no affine vortex component. Instead, setting the rescaling factor to be n_i, the sequence converges to the holomorphic sphere $z \mapsto [z-1, z]$ in $\mathbb{CP}^1$.

3. Gluing I: Statement

In this section we state the main theorem of this paper, under a precise version of the transversality assumption (though the definition of relevant Banach spaces are postponed to Section 4). In the first two subsections below, we need first describe the deformation of the marked upper half plane and the perturbation data.

3.1. **Deformation of the domain.** Let $l, \underline{l} \geqslant 0$ such that $l + \underline{l} \geqslant 1$. Let $\mathcal{N}_{l,\underline{l}}$ be the moduli space of configurations of $l + \underline{l}$ distinct points in $\mathbb{H}$, such that l of them are in the interior and $\underline{l}$ of them are on the boundary. We use

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{y}} := (\mathbf{y}, \underline{\mathbf{y}}) = (y_1, \dots, y_l; \underline{y}_1, \dots, \underline{y}_{\underline{l}})$$

to denote such a configuration. Two configurations are regarded equivalent if they are related by a translation $\mathtt{t} : \mathbb{H} \to \mathbb{H}$.

There are two other moduli spaces which we need to mention. For $k \geqslant 1$, there is a moduli space $\mathcal{N}_k$ of configurations of k distinct points in $\mathbb{C}$, with equivalence induced from complex translations. A representative is just denoted as

$$\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k).$$

For $m, \underline{m} \geqslant 0$ with $2m + \underline{m} \geqslant 2$, we also have the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{m,\underline{m}}$ of marked disks with $\underline{m} + 1$ boundary markings and m interior markings. An element of $\mathcal{M}_{m,\underline{m}}$ is represented by a configuration

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{z}} := (\mathbf{z}, \underline{\mathbf{z}}) = (z_1, \dots, z_m; \underline{z}_1, \dots, \underline{z}_{\underline{m}})$$

[1] not explained yet

where $z_i \in \mathbb{H} \smallsetminus \mathbb{R}$ and $\underline{z}_j \in \mathbb{R}$. The $\underline{m}+1$-st marked point is regarded as the infinity of $\mathbb{H}$. Two configurations are equivalent, i.e., they represent the same point in $\mathscr{M}_{m,\underline{m}}$ if they are related by a Möbius transformation of $\mathbb{H}$ that fixes the infinity.

Notation 3.1. Whenever we have a collection of objects a_i (without underline) indexed by $i = 1, \dots, n$ and a collection $\underline{a}_j$ (with underline) indexed by $j = 1, \dots, \underline{n}$, in many situations, for convenience, we will denote

$$a_i = \underline{a}_{i-n}, \ \forall i = n+1, \dots, n+\underline{n}.$$

Now we fix some notations for the tangent spaces of these moduli spaces. For $l, \underline{l} \geqslant 0$ with $\underline{l} + l \geqslant 1$, define

$$W_{l,\underline{l}} := \Big\{ \widetilde{\mathbf{t}} = (\mathbf{t}, \underline{\mathbf{t}}) = (t_1, \dots, t_l; \underline{t}_1, \dots, \underline{t}_{\underline{l}}) \in \mathbb{C}^l \times \mathbb{R}^{\underline{l}} \mid \mathrm{Re} \sum_{i=1}^{l} t_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\underline{l}} \underline{t}_j = 0 \Big\}.$$

It can be identified with $\mathbb{C}^l \times \mathbb{R}^{\underline{l}}$ modulo real translations. For $k \geqslant 1$, define

$$W_k := \Big\{ \mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_k) \in \mathbb{C}^k \mid \sum_{j=k}^{l} s_j = 0 \Big\}.$$

It is identified with $\mathbb{C}^k$ modulo complex translations. Then $W_{l,\underline{l}}$ can be identified with a tangent space of $\mathscr{N}_{l,\underline{l}}$ and W_k is identified with a tangent space of $\mathscr{N}_k$.

The tangent spaces of $\mathscr{M}_{m,\underline{m}}$ cannot be uniformly described. However, fix a representative $\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}$ of a point $[\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}] \in \mathscr{M}_{m,\underline{m}}$, one can specify a real codimension 2 linear subspace $W_{m,\underline{m}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}) \subset \mathbb{C}^m \times \mathbb{R}^{\underline{m}}$, such that for all $\widetilde{\mathbf{q}} = (\mathbf{q}, \underline{\mathbf{q}}) \in W_{m,\underline{m}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{z}})$ with $|\widetilde{\mathbf{q}}|$ small, $\widetilde{\mathbf{z}} + \widetilde{\mathbf{q}}$ gives a parametrization of a neighborhood of $[\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}]$ inside $\mathscr{M}_{m,\underline{m}}$.

Lastly, $\mathscr{N}_{l,\underline{l}}$ can be compactified by adding configurations that corresponding to cases when some points coming together or going away from each other (in different rates), and the compactified moduli space is denoted by $\overline{\mathscr{N}}_{l,\underline{l}}$. In this paper we do not need to consider compactifications of $\mathscr{N}_k$ or $\mathscr{M}_{m,\underline{m}}$.

We do not consider all possible degenerations of points of $\mathscr{N}_{l,\underline{l}}$, but will fix a "simple" stratum. Suppose we have a decomposition

$$l = \sum_{i=1}^{m} k_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\underline{m}} l_j, \ \underline{l} = \sum_{j=1}^{\underline{m}} \underline{l}_j, \ (k_i \geqslant 0, \ l_j \geqslant 0, \ \underline{l}_j \geqslant 0),$$

satisfying the stability condition

$$2m + \underline{m} \geqslant 2; \ k_i \geqslant 1, \ \forall i = 1, \dots, m; \ l_j + \underline{l}_j \geqslant 1, \ \forall j = 1, \dots, \underline{m}.$$

Then this decomposition, denoted by Δ, gives a stratum $\mathscr{N}_\Delta \subset \overline{\mathscr{N}}_{l,\underline{l}}$. Every point of $\mathscr{N}_\Delta$ is represented by a collection of configurations

$$\mathbf{x} = \Big(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m; \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_1, \dots, \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_{\underline{m}}; \widetilde{\mathbf{z}} \Big).$$

Here $\mathbf{x}_i$ represents a point $\mathscr{N}_{k_i}$, $\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_j = (\mathbf{y}_j, \underline{\mathbf{y}}_j)$ represents a point of $\mathscr{N}_{l_j,\underline{l}_j}$, and $\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}$ represents a point of $\mathscr{M}_{m,\underline{m}}$.

We fix a point $[\mathbf{x}] \in \mathcal{N}_\Delta$ and a representative $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m; \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_1, \dots, \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_{\underline{m}}; \widetilde{\mathbf{z}})$. Then we can identify the tangent space at $[\mathbf{x}]$, denoted for short by W_{def}, with the product

$$\prod_{i=1}^{m} W_{k_i} \times \prod_{j=1}^{\underline{m}} W_{l_j,\underline{l}_j} \times W_{m,\underline{m}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{z}}).$$

A vector of W_{def} is denoted by $\mathbf{a}$ and for $|\mathbf{a}|$ small enough, denote

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_\circ(\mathbf{a}) := \widetilde{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{a} \tag{3.1}$$

the deformed configuration defined in the obvious sense.

There is a universal curve

$$\begin{array}{c} \overline{\mathcal{U}}_{l,\underline{l}} \\ \big\downarrow \\ \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{l,\underline{l}} \end{array} . \tag{3.2}$$

We do not need the full description of the universal curve, but is only interested near the point $[\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}]$.

Introduce the gluing parameter $\epsilon \geqslant 0$. If $\widetilde{\mathbf{z}} = (\mathbf{z}, \underline{\mathbf{z}}) = (z_1, \dots, z_m; \underline{z}_1, \dots, \underline{z}_{\underline{m}})$, define

$$z_{i,\epsilon} := \frac{z_i}{\epsilon},\ i = 1, \dots, m + \underline{m}.$$

Define $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_\epsilon = (\mathbf{x}_\epsilon, \underline{\mathbf{x}}_\epsilon)$ where

$$\mathbf{x}_\epsilon = \Big(z_{i,\epsilon} + x_{i,\gamma}, \underline{z}_{j,\epsilon} + y_{j,\nu}\Big)^{1\leqslant j\leqslant \underline{m},\ 1\leqslant \nu\leqslant l_j}_{1\leqslant i\leqslant m,\ 1\leqslant \gamma\leqslant k_i},\ \underline{\mathbf{x}}_\epsilon = \Big(\underline{z}_{j,\epsilon} + \underline{y}_{j,\nu}\Big)_{1\leqslant j\leqslant \underline{m},\ 1\leqslant \nu\leqslant \underline{l}_j}.$$

Moreover, for any deformation parameter $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_m, \widetilde{\mathbf{t}}_1, \dots, \widetilde{\mathbf{t}}_{\underline{m}}, \widetilde{\mathbf{q}})$, define $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_\epsilon(\mathbf{a}) = (\underline{\mathbf{x}}_\epsilon(\mathbf{a}), \mathbf{x}_\epsilon(\mathbf{a}))$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_\epsilon(\mathbf{a}) &= \left(\frac{z_i + q_i}{\epsilon} + x_{i,\gamma} + s_{i,\gamma}, \frac{\underline{z}_j + \underline{q}_j}{\epsilon} + y_{j,\nu} + t_{j,\nu}\right)^{1\leqslant j\leqslant \underline{m},\ 1\leqslant \nu\leqslant l_j}_{1\leqslant i\leqslant m,\ 1\leqslant \gamma\leqslant k_i}, \\ \underline{\mathbf{x}}_\epsilon(\mathbf{a}) &= \left(\frac{\underline{z}_j + \underline{q}_j}{\epsilon} + \underline{y}_{j,\nu} + \underline{t}_{j,\nu}\right)_{1\leqslant j\leqslant \underline{m},\ 1\leqslant \nu\leqslant \underline{l}_j}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see the following fact.

Lemma 3.2. *For $\epsilon > 0$ small enough, the map $[0, \epsilon) \times W^\epsilon_{\mathrm{def}} \to \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{k,\underline{k}}$ defined by*

$$(\epsilon, \mathbf{a}) \mapsto [\mathbf{x}_\epsilon(\mathbf{a})]$$

is a homeomorphism onto a neighborhood of $[\mathbf{x}]$.

Remark 3.3. Although the singular domain can have arbitrarily many components, but there is only one gluing parameter and turning on ϵ resolves all nodes at the same time.

3.2. **Perturbation.** The universal curve $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_{l,\underline{l}}$ (see (3.2)) has a closed subset $\overline{\mathcal{U}}^{\mathrm{sing}}_{l,\underline{l}}$ consisting points that corresponds to marked points and nodes of the fibres. Denote

$$\overline{\mathcal{U}}^{\mathrm{reg}}_{l,\underline{l}} := \overline{\mathcal{U}}_{l,\underline{l}} \setminus \overline{\mathcal{U}}^{\mathrm{sing}}_{l,\underline{l}}.$$

$\overline{\mathcal{U}}^{\mathrm{reg}}_{l,\underline{l}}$ has a structure of smooth manifold.

Definition 3.4. A perturbation data consists of a finite dimensional moduli space W and a (not necessarily linear) map

$$\iota : W_{\mathrm{per}} \to \Gamma_c(\overline{\mathcal{U}}^{\mathrm{reg}}_{l,\underline{l}} \times X, TX)$$

Here Γ_c means smooth sections whose fibrewise supports are compact. Moreover we require that ι satisfies the following conditions.

(a) ι is K-equivariant, namely, for $\mathbf{p} \in W_{\mathrm{per}}$, $\mathbf{z} \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}^{\mathrm{reg}}_{l,\underline{l}}$ and $g \in K$, we have

$$\iota(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{z}, gx) = g_* \iota(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{z}, x) \in T_{gx}X.$$

(b) ι is supported in the semi-stable locus X^{ss}, and, with respect to the decomposition $T_X|_{X^{ss}} = H_X \oplus G_X$, the values of ι are contained in H_X.

Remark 3.5. In the setting of [22], where we will use the stabilizing divisor technique of Cieliebak-Mohnke [4], we consider almost complex structures $J_{\mathbf{z}}$ that depends on the point $\mathbf{z} \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}^{\mathrm{reg}}_{l,\underline{l}}$. Then the difference $J_{\mathbf{z}} - J_X$ is such a perturbation ι.

3.3. **Simple stable affine vortices.** We only consider a "partial" compactification of $\mathcal{M}_{l,\underline{l}}(\mathbb{H}; X, L)$, by the so-called "simple" stable affine vortices.

Definition 3.6. A simple stable $\mathbb{H}$-vortex consists of the following objects

(a) A representative $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_m; \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_1, \cdots, \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_{\underline{m}}; \widetilde{\mathbf{z}})$ representing a point $[\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}] \in \mathcal{N}_\Delta$.
(b) An element $\mathbf{p} \in W_{\mathrm{per}}$.
(c) A collection of gauged maps $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{v}_\infty, \mathbf{v}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_m, \underline{\mathbf{v}}_1, \ldots, \underline{\mathbf{v}}_{\underline{m}})$ where $\mathbf{v}_\infty$ and $\underline{\mathbf{v}}_1, \ldots, \underline{\mathbf{v}}_{\underline{m}}$ are defined on $\mathbb{H}$ with boundaries lie in L and $\mathbf{v}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_m$ are defined on $\mathbb{C}$.

They satisfy the following conditions.

(a) **(Perturbed Equation)** $\mathbf{v}_\infty = (u_\infty, \phi_\infty, \psi_\infty)$ satisfies

$$\partial_s u_\infty + \mathfrak{X}_{\phi_\infty} + J_X(\partial_t u_\infty + \mathfrak{X}_{\psi_\infty}) + \iota_\infty(\mathbf{p}, \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}, u_\infty) = 0,\ \mu(u_\infty) = 0. \tag{3.3}$$

For $i = 1, \ldots, m + \underline{m}$, $\mathbf{v}_i = (u_i, \phi_i, \psi_i)$ satisfies

$$\partial_s u_\infty + \mathfrak{X}_{\phi_i} + J_X(\partial_t u_i + \mathfrak{X}_{\psi_i}) + \iota_i(\mathbf{p}, \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}, u_i) = 0,\ \partial_s \psi_i - \partial_t \phi_i + [\phi_i, \psi_i] + \mu(u_i) = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

(b) **(Matching condition)** $\mathbf{v}_i(\infty) = \bar{u}_\infty(z_i) \in \bar{X}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and $\underline{\mathbf{v}}_j(\infty) = \bar{u}_\infty(\underline{z}_j) \in \bar{L}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, \underline{m}$. Here $\bar{u}_\infty$ is the map to $\bar{X}$ induced from $\mathbf{v}_\infty$.

There are two reasons why we do not consider the case of having unstable components. If there are unstable components one just adds extra marked points to stabilize, which does not make an essential difference. On the other hand, in the case of using stabilizing divisors and domain dependent almost complex structures (which is the approach of [22]), there cannot be unstable components in a stable object.

On the other hand, an $(l, \underline{l})$-marked perturbed $\mathbb{H}$-vortex consists of a perturbation parameter $\mathbf{p} \in W_{\mathrm{per}}$, a representative $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_\epsilon(\mathbf{a})$ of a point in $\mathcal{N}_{l,\underline{l}}$ for $\epsilon > 0$ and a gauged map $\mathbf{v} = (u, \phi, \psi)$ satisfying the equation

$$\partial_s u + \mathfrak{X}_\phi + J_X(\partial_t u + \mathfrak{X}_\psi) + \iota_\epsilon(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{a}, u) = 0,\ \partial_s \psi - \partial_t \phi + [\phi, \psi] + \mu(u) = 0.$$

Definition 3.7. Let $(\mathbf{p}_\nu, \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\epsilon_\nu}(\mathbf{a}_\nu), \mathbf{v}_\nu)$, $\nu = 1, 2, \ldots$ be a sequence of $(k, \underline{k})$-marked, perturbed $\mathbb{H}$-vortices and $(\mathbf{p}_\circ, \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_\circ(\mathbf{a}_\circ), \mathbf{v}_\circ)$ is a stable perturbed $\mathbb{H}$-vortex of type Δ, with components $\mathbf{v}_\infty, \mathbf{v}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_m, \underline{\mathbf{v}}_1, \ldots, \underline{\mathbf{v}}_{\underline{m}}$, as described in Definition 3.6. We say that $(\mathbf{p}_\nu, \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\epsilon_\nu}(\mathbf{a}_\nu), \mathbf{v}_\nu)$ converges to $(\mathbf{p}_\circ, \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_\circ(\mathbf{a}_\circ), \mathbf{v}_\circ)$ if for ν sufficiently large, the following conditions are satisfied.

(a) $(\epsilon_\nu, \mathbf{p}_\nu, \mathbf{a}_\nu)$ converges to $(0, \mathbf{p}_\circ, \mathbf{a}_\circ)$ in $[0, \epsilon) \times W_{\mathrm{per}} \times W_{\mathrm{def}}$.
(b) For $i = 1, \ldots, m$, define the translation $\mathtt{t}_{i,\nu}(z) = z - \frac{z_i + q_{i,\nu}}{\epsilon_\nu}$ (where $q_{i,\nu}$ is the q_i-component of $\mathbf{a}_\nu$). Then the sequence $\mathbf{v}_\nu \circ \mathtt{t}_{i,\nu}$ converges u.c.s. on $\mathbb{C}$ to $\mathbf{v}_i$.
(c) For $j = 1, \ldots, \underline{m}$, define the translation $\underline{\mathtt{t}}_{j,\nu}(z) = z - \frac{\underline{z}_j + \underline{q}_{j,\nu}}{\epsilon_\nu}$ (where $\underline{q}_{j,\nu}$ is the $\underline{q}_j$-component of $\mathbf{a}_\nu$). Then the sequence $\mathbf{v}_\nu \circ \underline{\mathtt{t}}_{j,\nu}$ converges u.c.s. on $\mathbb{H}$ to $\underline{\mathbf{v}}_j$.
(d) Define $\varphi_\nu(z) = \epsilon_\nu z$. Then $\mathbf{v}_\nu \circ \varphi_\nu^{-1}$ converges uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{H} \setminus \{z_1, \ldots, z_m, \underline{z}_1, \ldots, \underline{z}_{\underline{m}}\}$ to the gauged map $\mathbf{v}_\infty$.
(e) There is no energy loss, i.e.,

$$\lim_{\nu \to \infty} E(\mathbf{v}_\nu) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} E(\mathbf{v}_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{\underline{m}} E(\underline{\mathbf{v}}_j) + E(\mathbf{v}_\infty).$$

By the K-equivariance of the perturbation ι, one can define an equivalence relation among perturbed stable affine vortices using gauge transformations. Let

$$\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon_0}_{l,\underline{l}}(\mathbb{H}; X, L)$$

be the moduli space of such equivalence classes. Definition 3.7 plus the obvious notion topology inside the lower stratum induces a topology on $\overline{\mathcal{M}}^{\epsilon_0}_{l,\underline{l}}(\mathbb{H}; X, L)$, which can be proved to be Hausdorff. The main theorem of this paper is, under certain transversality assumption, one can give a chart of (topological) manifold with boundary around a singular object. To state the main theorem in precise language, we first need to state the transversality assumption.

Remark 3.8. When constructing the local chart, especially when proving the local surjectivity of the gluing map, one has to prove the notion of convergence given by Definition 3.7 (which is weaker) implies the stronger convergence in terms of Banach space norms. The relevant norms are introduced in later sections and the fact that weaker convergence implies stronger convergence will be proved in the appendix.

3.4. **Transversality and the gluing map.** Let us fix a central singular object of $\mathscr{M}_\Delta^{\epsilon_0}(\mathbb{H}; X, L)$ with a representative $(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{x}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\circ)$. Let $\mathbf{v}_\circ$ have components $\mathbf{v}_\infty, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{m+\underline{m}}$. Let $\bar{x}_i \in \bar{X}$ (resp. $\underline{\bar{x}}_j \in \bar{L}$) be the limit of $\mathbf{v}_i$ (resp. $\underline{\mathbf{v}}_j$) at infinity.

For each affine vortex component $\mathbf{v}_i$, there is a Banach manifold $\hat{\mathscr{B}}_i$ containing $\mathbf{v}_i$, a Banach vector bundle $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_i \to \hat{\mathscr{B}}_i$, and a smooth Fredholm section

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_i : W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_i \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_i$$

such that $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_i(\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{v}_i) = 0$. There are also smooth evaluation maps

$$\mathrm{ev}_i : \hat{\mathscr{B}}_i \to \bar{X},\ i = 1, \dots, m;$$
$$\underline{\mathrm{ev}}_j : \hat{\underline{\mathscr{B}}}_j \to \bar{L},\ j = 1, \dots, \underline{m},$$

such that $\mathrm{ev}_i(\mathbf{v}_i) = \bar{x}_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m + \underline{m}$.

On the other hand, in Subsection 4.2 we define a Banach manifold $\mathscr{B}_\infty^H$ containing the map u_∞, a Banach vector bundle $\mathscr{E}_\infty^H \to \mathscr{B}_\infty^H$, and a Fredholm section

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_\infty^H : W \times \mathscr{B}_\infty^H \to \mathscr{E}_\infty^H$$

such that $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_\infty^H(\mathbf{w}_0, u_\infty) = 0$. There are also smooth evaluation maps

$$\mathrm{ev}_\infty^i : \mathscr{B}_\infty^H \to \bar{X},\ i = 1, \dots, m;$$
$$\underline{\mathrm{ev}}_\infty^j : \mathscr{B}_\infty^H \to \bar{L},\ j = 1, \dots, \underline{m}$$

such that $\mathrm{ev}_\infty^i(\mathbf{v}_\infty) = \bar{x}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m + \underline{m}$.

Hypothesis 3.9.
(a) For $i = 1, \dots, m + \underline{m}$, the linearization of $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_i$ at $(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_i)$, denoted by $\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_i : W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_i \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_i$, is surjective.
(b) The linearization of $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_\infty^H$ at $(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_\infty)$, denoted by $\widetilde{D}_\infty^H : W \times \mathscr{B}_\infty^H \to \mathscr{E}_\infty^H$, is surjective.
(c) The map

$$\ker(\widetilde{D}_\infty^H) \times \prod_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \ker(\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_i) \to W^{m+\underline{m}+1} \times \prod_{i=1}^{m} (T_{\bar{x}_i}\bar{X})^2 \times \prod_{j=1}^{\underline{m}} (T_{\bar{x}_j}\bar{L})^2$$

defined by

$$\Big((\mathbf{w}_\infty, \xi_\infty^H), (\mathbf{w}_1, \boldsymbol{\xi}_1), \dots, (\mathbf{w}_{m+\underline{m}}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{m+\underline{m}})\Big)$$
$$\mapsto \Big((\mathbf{w}_\infty, \mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{m+\underline{m}}), (\mathrm{dev}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i), \mathrm{dev}_\infty^i(\xi_\infty^H))_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant m},\ (\mathrm{dev}_j(\boldsymbol{\xi}_j), \mathrm{dev}_\infty^j(\xi_\infty^H))_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant \underline{m}}\Big)$$

is transverse to the diagonal

$$\Delta^{m+\underline{m}+1}(W) \times \prod_{i=1}^{m} \Delta(T_{\bar{x}_i}\bar{X}) \times \prod_{j=1}^{\underline{m}} \Delta(T_{\bar{x}_j}\bar{L}).$$

Theorem 3.10. *Under Hypothesis 3.9, there exist $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \epsilon_0)$ and a continuous map*

$$\mathscr{G}\ell\widetilde{u}\widetilde{e} : \mathscr{M}_\Delta^{\epsilon_1}(\mathbb{H}; X, L) \times [0, \epsilon_1) \to \overline{\mathscr{M}}_{l,\underline{l}}(\mathbb{H}; X, L)$$

which is a homeomorphism onto a neighborhood of $[\mathbf{p}_\circ, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\circ(\mathbf{a}_0), \mathbf{v}_\circ]$ inside the target. Moreover, $\mathscr{G}\ell\widetilde{u}\widetilde{e}([\mathbf{p}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\circ(\mathbf{a}), \mathbf{v}], 0) = [\mathbf{p}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\circ(\mathbf{a}), \mathbf{v}]$ for all $[\mathbf{p}, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_\circ(\mathbf{a}), \mathbf{v}] \in \overline{\mathscr{M}}_\Delta^{\epsilon_1}(\mathbb{H}; X, L)$.

3.5. **Further Remarks.** Theorem 3.10 can be certainly extended and generalized to other situations, including the unbordered case and cases for more complicated strata. Here we briefly comment on these extensions and explain why there should be no further technical difficulties in generalizing.

In application one should consider more general cases, where the factor $W_{\mathrm{per}} \times W_{\mathrm{def}}$ does not only give perturbations for the vortices, but also contains perturbations for another Fredholm problem. More precisely, let $\mathscr{B}'$ be an (infinite dimensional) Banach manifold and $\mathscr{E}' \to \mathscr{B}'$ be a Banach bundle (of infinite rank). Suppose one has a smooth Fredholm section

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}' : W_{\mathrm{per}} \times \overline{\mathcal{N}}_{l,\underline{l}} \times \mathscr{B}' \to \mathscr{E}'.$$

This additional Fredholm problem is correlated to the one of affine vortices, via certain "matching condition." Namely, we can assume that there is a finite dimensional real vector space Y and a smooth evaluation map

$$\mathrm{ev}' : W \times \mathscr{B}' \to Y.$$

Then one can consider the moduli spaces of pairs of solutions to the two problems that are perturbed by the same parameter and whose evaluations belong to the diagonal of Y. To construct the gluing map for this moduli space, the transversality condition is stated in a slightly more complicated way. But without essential difference, one can easily extend Theorem 3.10 to this case.

The extra Fredholm problem $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}' : \widetilde{\mathscr{B}}' \to \widetilde{\mathscr{E}}'$ can then be regarded as the equation for extra components in a more complicated "stable" object. For example, the infinity component $\mathbf{v}_\infty$ can be attached to a stable holomorphic curve in $\bar{X}$, and vortex component $\mathbf{v}_i$ can also have a bubble tree of stable holomorphic disks or spheres in X. In [22] it will also contain flow lines of certain Morse function.

Although we do not give the explicit construction for the closed case when $\mathbf{v}_\infty$ is a holomorphic sphere and all $\mathbf{v}_i$ are $\mathbb{C}$-vortices, but the method we are going to use should be easily extended to that case.

4. Gluing II: Preparation

In Definition 3.7 we see that the component $\mathbf{v}_\infty$ is the limit after a large rescaling. When we glue, we need to rescale $\mathbf{v}_\infty$ back by the gluing parameter ϵ. The main purpose of this section is then, to construct a right inverse along the singular object where the disk component is rescaled by ϵ, and to show however the norm of the right inverse is uniformly bounded by a constant independent of ϵ. Obviously this also requires a careful choice of a system of ϵ-dependent weighted Sobolev norms.

We fix $p \in (2, 4)$ and denote $\delta = 2 - \frac{4}{p}$, which satisfies

$$1 - \frac{2}{p} < \delta < 1. \tag{4.1}$$

Let C be a Riemann surface and let (u,a) be a gauged map from a Riemann surface C to X of regularity $W^{1,p}$. Abbreviate

$$E_u = u^*TX,\ E_u^+ = E_u \oplus (\Lambda^1 \otimes \mathfrak{k}).$$

To differentiate sections of E_u, we need a connection. Let $\widetilde{\nabla}$ be the Levi-Civita connection of h_X given by Lemma 2.2. Then L is totally geodesic with respect to $\widetilde{\nabla}$. However $\widetilde{\nabla}$ does not respect the splitting $H_X \oplus G_X$ near $\mu^{-1}(0)$. We modify $\widetilde{\nabla}$ in a neighborhood of $\mu^{-1}(0)$ so that in a smaller neighborhood the modified connection ∇ respects the splitting. ∇ is still a metric connection and still K-invariant, and we claim that L is totally geodesic with respect to ∇, i.e., $\nabla_{V_1} V_2 \in \Gamma(TL)$ for all vector fields V_1, V_2 tangent to L. Indeed, $TL \simeq K_X \oplus (TL \cap H_X)$, where K_X is the distribution generated by infinitesimal K-actions. Then $\nabla_{V_1} V_2 = \widetilde{\nabla}_{V_1} V_2 + E_{V_1}(V_2) + E^*_{V_1}(V_2)$ where E_{V_1} is the component of $\widetilde{\nabla}_{V_1}$ which maps H_X to G_X. Since L is totally geodesic with respect to $\widetilde{\nabla}$, $E_{V_1}(V_2) \in K_X$ and $E^*_{V_1}(V_2) \in TL \cap H_X$. Therefore $\nabla_{V_1} V_2 \in TL$.

Then for $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi, \alpha) \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(C, E_u^+)$, define the covariant derivative

$$\nabla^a \boldsymbol{\xi} = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla^a \xi \\ \nabla^a \alpha \end{bmatrix} = ds \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_s \xi + \nabla_\xi \mathfrak{X}_\phi \\ \nabla_s \alpha + [\phi, \alpha] \end{bmatrix} + dt \otimes \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_t \xi + \nabla_\xi \mathfrak{X}_\psi \\ \nabla_t \alpha + [\psi, \alpha] \end{bmatrix}.$$

∇^a is K-equivariant in the following sense. If $\hbar : C \to K$ is a gauge transformation of regularity $W^{2,p}$, then $\hbar \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi} \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(C, E^+_{\hbar \cdot u})$, where the action is induced from the K-action on X and the adjoint action on $\mathfrak{k}$, such that

$$\nabla^{\hbar \cdot a}(\hbar \cdot \boldsymbol{\xi}) = \hbar \cdot \nabla^a \boldsymbol{\xi}.$$

4.1. **Linearization of affine vortices.** We choose a smooth weight function $\rho_{\mathbb{A}} : \mathbb{A} \to [1, +\infty)$ such that outside the unit disk, $\rho_{\mathbb{A}}(z) = |z|^2$. For sections $f \in L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{A}, E)$ of a Euclidean bundle $E \to \mathbb{A}$ and any open subset $U \subset \mathbb{A}$, define

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,\delta}(U)} := \left[\int_U |f(z)|^p (\rho_{\mathbb{A}}(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} ds dt \right]^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

When $U = \mathbb{A}$, this norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_{L^{p,\delta}}$. We try to minimize the use of higher order Sobolev norms because that often requires a choice of connection, unless E is canonically trivialized.

Consider the affine vortex $\mathbf{v}_i = (u_i, a_i)$. Abbreviate $E_i := E_{u_i}$ and $E_i^+ := E^+_{u_i}$. Let $U \subset \mathbb{A}_i$ be an open subset. Following the analytic set-up of [28] and [15], we introduce the following norm on sections $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i = (\xi_i, \alpha_i) \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(U, E_i^+)$ by

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_m(U)} := \|\xi_i\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla^{a_i} \boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_{L^{p,\delta}(U)} + \|d\mu \cdot \xi_i\|_{L^{p,\delta}(U)} + \|d\mu \cdot J_X \xi_i\|_{L^{p,\delta}(U)} + \|\alpha_i\|_{L^{p,\delta}(U)}. \tag{4.2}$$

Here m stands for "mixed." When $U = \mathbb{A}_i$, this norm is abbreviated by $\|\cdot\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_m}$. Notice that this norm is gauge invariant.

For $i = 1, \ldots, m$, let $\hat{\mathscr{B}}_i \subset W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{A}_i, E_i^+)$ be the subspace of sections whose $\|\cdot\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_m}$-norms are finite. For $j = 1, \ldots, \underline{m}$, let $W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\underline{\mathbb{A}}_j, \underline{E}_j^+)_L \subset W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\underline{\mathbb{A}}_j, \underline{E}_j^+)$ be the subspace

of sections (ξ,α) satisfying $\xi|_{\partial\underline{\mathbb{A}}_j}\subset TL$ and $*\alpha|_{\partial\underline{\mathbb{A}}_j}=0$. Let $\underline{\mathscr{B}}_j\subset W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\underline{\mathbb{A}}_j,\underline{E}_j^+)_L$ be the subspace of sections whose $\|\cdot\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_m}$-norm are finite. It was proved in [28] for $\mathbb{A}_i=\mathbb{C}$ and in [15] for $\underline{\mathbb{A}}_j=\mathbb{H}$ that every $\hat{\mathscr{B}}_i$ equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_m}$ is a Banach space.

The above norm deserves a more geometric presentation, once $\mathbf{v}_i$ is put in a suitable gauge. Denote

$$\Lambda_K=\{a\in\mathfrak{k}\mid \exp(2\pi a)=\mathrm{Id}_K\}.$$

Then essentially by [6, Proposition 11.1], for $i=1,\dots,m$, there exist $\lambda_i\in\Lambda_K$ and $x_i\in\mu^{-1}(0)$ such that, via a suitable smooth gauge transformation,

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}e^{\lambda_i\theta}u_i(re^{i\theta})=x_i.$$

By [16, Theorem 2.8], for $j=1,\dots,\underline{m}$, there exists $\underline{x}_j\in L$ such that via a suitable smooth gauge transformation,

$$\lim_{r\to\infty}\underline{u}_j(z)=\underline{x}_j.$$

The difference between $\mathbb{C}$-vortices and $\mathbb{H}$-vortices in the asymptotic behavior is that at infinity, $\mathbb{H}$ has trivial topology while $\mathbb{C}$ has a nontrivial loop. To simplify notations, denote

$$\underline{\lambda}_j=\lambda_{m+j}=0,\ j=1,\dots,\underline{m}.$$

Let $B_R\subset\mathbb{A}$ be the radius R open disk centered at the origin and $C_R:=\mathbb{A}\smallsetminus B_R$, for either $\mathbb{A}=\mathbb{C}$ or $\mathbb{A}=\mathbb{H}$. Over C_R, define

$$\check{\mathbf{v}}_i=(\check{A}_i,\check{u}_i)=e^{\lambda_i\theta}\mathbf{v}_i.$$

Moreover, we have a refined statement on the asymptotic behavior of the affine vortices.

Lemma 4.1. [15] *By applying a suitable gauge transformation, we can assume $\mathbf{v}_i$ satisfies the the following conditions.*

(a) For $i=1,\dots,m$, there exist $x_i\in X$, $\lambda_i\in\Lambda_K$, $R>0$ and $\widetilde{\xi}_i\in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(C_R,T_{x_i}X)$ such that $u_i|_{C_R}=e^{-\lambda_i\theta}\exp_{x_i}\widetilde{\xi}_i$

$$\lim_{z\to\infty}\widetilde{\xi}_i(z)=0,\ \|\nabla\widetilde{\xi}_i\|_{L^{p,\delta}(C_R)}+\|d\mu\cdot\widetilde{\xi}_i\|_{L^{p,\delta}(C_R)}+\|d\mu\cdot J_X\widetilde{\xi}_i\|_{L^{p,\delta}(C_R)}<\infty.$$

Moreover, $\check{\alpha}_i\in W^{1,p,\delta}(C_R,\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{k})$.

(b) For $j=1,\dots,\underline{m}$, there exist $\underline{x}_j\in L$, $R>0$ and $\underline{\widetilde{\xi}}_j\in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(C_R,T_{\underline{x}_j}X)_L$ such that $\underline{u}_j|_{C_R}=\exp_{\underline{x}_j}\underline{\widetilde{\xi}}_j$ and

$$\lim_{z\to\infty}\underline{\widetilde{\xi}}_j(z)=0,\ \|\nabla\underline{\widetilde{\xi}}_j\|_{L^{p,\delta}(C_R)}+\|d\mu\cdot\underline{\widetilde{\xi}}_j\|_{L^{p,\delta}(C_R)}+\|d\mu\cdot J_X\underline{\widetilde{\xi}}_j\|_{L^{p,\delta}(C_R)}<\infty.$$

Moreover, one has $\underline{\alpha}_j\in W^{1,p,\delta}(\mathbb{H},\Lambda^1\otimes\mathfrak{k})_N$.

We remark that (4.1) is necessary to prove this lemma while $\delta=2-\frac{4}{p}$ is not needed.

The asymptotic behaviors of $\mathbf{v}_i$ also imply that for R large, $u_i(C_R)\subset U_X$ where we can decompose ξ_i into the H_X component ξ_i^H and the G_X component ξ_i^G. The following lemma follows from Proposition A.1.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose all $\mathbf{v}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and all $\underline{\mathbf{v}}_j$ for $j = 1, \dots, \underline{m}$ satisfy the conditions of Lemma 4.1.*

(a) For each i and $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i = (\xi_i, \alpha_i) \in \hat{\mathcal{B}}_i$, there exists $\xi_i^H(\infty) \in T_{x_i} X$ such that

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} e^{\lambda_i \theta} \xi_i^H(z) = \xi_i^H(\infty), \ \lim_{z\to\infty} e^{\lambda_i \theta} \xi_i^G(z) = 0.$$

(b) For each j and $\underline{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_j = (\underline{\xi}_j, \underline{\alpha}_j) \in \underline{\hat{\mathcal{B}}}_j$, there exists $\underline{\xi}_j^H(\infty) \in T_{\underline{x}_j} L$ such that

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} \underline{\xi}_j^H(z) = \underline{\xi}_j^H(\infty), \ \lim_{z\to\infty} \underline{\xi}_j^G(z) = 0.$$

(c) For $i = 1, \dots, m + \underline{m}$, the correspondence $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \mapsto \xi_i^H(\infty)$ is bounded with respect to the norm $\| \cdot \|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_m}$.

(d) For $i = 1, \dots, m + \underline{m}$, if there are $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,\gamma} = (\xi_{i,\gamma}, \alpha_{i,\gamma})$, $\gamma = 1, 2$ such that

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} e^{\lambda_i \theta} \xi_{i,1}^H(z) = \lim_{z\to\infty} e^{\lambda_i \theta} \xi_{i,2}^H(z),$$

then

$$e^{\lambda_i} \xi_{i,1}^H - e^{\lambda_i} \xi_{i,2}^H \in L^{p,\delta-1}(C_R, E_i).$$

In other words, after subtracting the limit at infinity, the H_X-component of $e^{\lambda_i \theta} \xi_i$ is of class $W^{1,p,\alpha}$ with respect to the cylindrical coordinate, for $\alpha = \delta - 1 + \frac{2}{p} > 0$.

Using the exponential map exp of h_X, one identifies $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{B}}_i$ whose norm is small with a nearby object

$$\mathbf{v}_i' := (u_i', a_i') := \exp_{\mathbf{v}_i} \boldsymbol{\xi}_i := (\exp_{u_i} \xi_i, a_i + \alpha_i). \tag{4.3}$$

Notice that $\underline{u}_j'(\partial\mathbb{H}) \subset L$ since L is totally geodesic with respect to h_X. Therefore, we identify a small ball centered at the origin of $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_i$ with a Banach manifold of triples $\mathbf{v}_i'$ which can be written in the form of (4.3). By abuse of notation, we still use $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_i$ to denote this Banach manifold. Then Lemma 4.2 implies that there are smooth evaluation maps

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{ev}_i : \hat{\mathcal{B}}_i \to \bar{X}, \ 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m; \\ &\underline{\mathrm{ev}}_j : \underline{\hat{\mathcal{B}}}_j \to \bar{L}, \ 1 \leqslant j \leqslant \underline{m}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Define a Banach vector bundle $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_i \to \hat{\mathcal{B}}_i$ whose fibre over $\mathbf{v}_i'$ is $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_i|_{\mathbf{v}_i'} := L^{p,\delta}(\mathbb{A}_i, E_i^+)$. The vortex equation, plus the Coulomb gauge condition relative to $\mathbf{v}_i$ defines a section $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i : \hat{\mathcal{B}}_i \to \hat{\mathcal{E}}_i$, which reads

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i(\mathbf{v}_i') = \begin{bmatrix} \partial_s u_i' + \mathfrak{X}_{\phi_i'}(u_i') + J_X(\partial_t u_i' + \mathfrak{X}_{\psi_i'}(u_i')) \\ \partial_s \eta_i + [\phi_i, \eta_i] + \partial_t \zeta_i + [\psi_i, \zeta_i] + d\mu \cdot J_X \xi_i \\ \partial_s \psi_i' - \partial_t \phi_i' + [\phi_i', \psi_i'] + \mu(u_i') \end{bmatrix}.$$

For convenience, we placed the gauge fixing condition in the second entry.

The perturbation restricted to the i-th affine vortex component gives a smooth map

$$\iota_i : W \times \hat{\mathcal{B}}_i \to \hat{\mathcal{E}}_i.$$

We know that for $\mathbf{w} \in W = W_{\mathrm{per}} \times W_{\mathrm{def}}$,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_i(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_i) := \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i(\mathbf{v}_i) + \iota_i(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_i) = 0.$$

Using the connection ∇ one can trivialize $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_i$ (near $\mathbf{v}_i$). So we view $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_i$ as a Banach space identified with its fibre over $\mathbf{v}_i$. A general vector of $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_i$ is denoted by $\boldsymbol{\nu}_i = (\nu_i, \kappa_i, \varsigma_i)$. With respect to this trivialization one has the linearized operator of $\hat{\mathscr{F}}_i$ at $\mathbf{v}_i$, denoted by $\hat{\mathscr{D}}_i : \hat{\mathscr{B}}_i \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_i$, which reads

$$\hat{\mathscr{D}}_i(\xi_i, \eta_i, \zeta_i) = \begin{bmatrix} D_i(\xi_i) + \mathfrak{X}_{\eta_i} + J_X \mathfrak{X}_{\zeta_i} \\ \partial_s \eta_i + [\phi_i, \eta_i] + \partial_t \zeta_i + [\psi_i, \zeta_i] + d\mu \cdot (J_X \xi_i) \\ \partial_s \zeta_i + [\phi_i, \zeta_i] - \partial_t \eta_i - [\psi_i, \eta_i] + d\mu \cdot \xi_i \end{bmatrix}.$$

Here the first entry is the linearization of the Cauchy-Riemann operator and

$$D_i(\xi_i) = \nabla_s \xi_i + \nabla_{\xi_i} \mathfrak{X}_{\phi_i} + (\nabla_{\xi_i} J_X)(\partial_t u_i + \mathfrak{X}_{\psi_i}) + J_X(\nabla_t \xi_i + \nabla_{\xi_i} \mathfrak{X}_{\psi_i}).$$

It was proved in [28] (for $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{C}$) and [15] (for $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{H}$) that $\hat{\mathscr{D}}_i$ is Fredholm.

The linearization of the perturbation ι_i at $(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_i)$ is denoted by

$$\ell_i : W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_i \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_i$$

Denote the total derivative by

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_i : W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_i \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_i,\ \widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_i(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_i) = \ell_i(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_i) + \hat{\mathscr{D}}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i).$$

By (a) of Hypothesis 3.9, $\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_i$ is surjective.

4.2. **Linearization of the marked disk.** Now we consider the deformation theory of a holomorphic disk $\bar{u}_\infty : (\mathbb{H}, \partial\mathbb{H}) \to (\bar{X}, \bar{L})$ with marked points $z_1, \ldots, z_m, \underline{z}_1, \ldots, \underline{z}_{\underline{m}}$, which is already lifted to a gauged map $\mathbf{v}_\infty = (u_\infty, \phi_\infty, \psi_\infty)$, satisfying (3.3).

Since the image of u_∞ is contained in $\mu^{-1}(0)$, one has the splitting

$$u_\infty^* TX = E_\infty = H_\infty \oplus G_\infty = u_\infty^* H_X \oplus u_\infty^* G_X.$$

Denote

$$G_\infty^+ = G_\infty \oplus \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{k},\ E_\infty^+ = E_\infty \oplus \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathfrak{g}.$$

For any open subset $U \subset \Sigma$, we use $\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty = (\xi_\infty, \eta_\infty, \zeta_\infty)$ to denote a general element of $W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(U, E_\infty^+)$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}_\infty = (\nu_\infty, \kappa_\infty, \varsigma_\infty)$ to denote a general element of $L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(U, E_\infty^+)$. Then one can split ξ_∞ (resp. ν_∞) into the components $\xi_\infty^H, \xi_\infty^G$ (resp. ν_∞^H, ν_∞^G). Let $W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(U, E_\infty^+)_L$ to denote those $\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty$ such that

$$\xi_\infty|_{\partial U} \subset TL,\ \zeta_\infty|_{\partial U} = 0.$$

4.2.1. *Weighted norms.* In order to state the linear theory of disks, we need to describe a Fredholm section on certain Banach manifold. We regard $\mathbf{v}_\infty$ being defined on the punctured domain $\Sigma = \mathbb{H} \smallsetminus \{z_1, \ldots, z_m, \underline{z}_1, \ldots, \underline{z}_{\underline{m}}\}$ rather than the unpunctured $\mathbb{H}$, and the Banach manifold is modelled on a weighted Sobolev space over Σ.

Let *dsdt* be the standard area form of $\mathbb{H}$.

Take a small $r > 0$ such that the disks $U_{i,2} := B(z_i, 2r)$ are mutually disjoint for all $i = 1, \ldots, m + \underline{m}$. Denote $U_{i,1} = B(z_i, r)$, $U_1 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} U_{i,1}$, $U_2 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} U_{i,2}$.

Let $\sigma_\infty^H : \Sigma \to [1, +\infty)$ equal to 1 on $\Sigma \smallsetminus U_2$ and equal to $|z - z_i|^{-4}$ inside $U_{i,1}$. Therefore, the metric g_∞^H with area form $\sigma_\infty^H dsdt$ is asymptotically Euclidean near punctures and infinity.

Let $\rho_\infty^H : \Sigma \to [1, +\infty)$ be a weight function which equals to $|z|^2$ on $\Sigma \smallsetminus U_2$ and equals to $|z - z_i|^{-2}$ inside $U_{i,1}$.

Let $\rho_\infty^G : \mathbb{H} \to [1, +\infty)$ be another weight function which equals to 1 inside U_1 and equals $|z|^2$ on $\Sigma \smallsetminus U_2$.

Let σ_∞^G be the constant 1.

Definition 4.3. Let $U \subset \Sigma$ be an open subset and $E \to U$ be a Euclidean vector bundle.

(a) For $f \in L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(U, E)$, define

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f\|_{L_G^{p,\delta}(U)} &:= \left[\int_U |f(z)|^p (\rho_\infty^G(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} (\sigma_\infty^G(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}} dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}; \\
\|f\|_{L_H^{p,\delta}(U)} &:= \left[\int_U |f(z)|^p (\rho_\infty^H(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} (\sigma_\infty^H(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}} dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}; \\
\|f\|_{L_{H;c}^{p,\delta}(U)} &:= \left[\int_U |f(z)|^p (\rho_\infty^H(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} \sigma_\infty^H(z) dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

(b) For $\boldsymbol{\nu}_\infty = (\nu_\infty^H, \boldsymbol{\nu}_\infty^G) \in L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(U, H_\infty \oplus G_\infty^+)$, define

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_\infty\|_{L_m^{p,\delta}(U)} := \|\nu_\infty^H\|_{L_H^{p,\delta}(U)} + \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_\infty^G\|_{L_G^{p,\delta}(U)}.$$

When $U = \Sigma$, denote this norm by $\|\cdot\|_{L_m^{p,\delta}}$. Define

$$\hat{\mathscr{E}}_\infty = \left\{\boldsymbol{\nu}_\infty \in L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Sigma, E_\infty^+) \ | \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_\infty\|_{L_m^{p,\delta}} < \infty\right\}.$$

If $\boldsymbol{\nu}_\infty$ has 1-form coefficients, we use the same formula to define $\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_\infty\|_{L_m^{p,\delta}(U)}$ by taking $|ds| = |dt| = 1$.

(c) For $\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty = (\xi_\infty^H, \boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty^G) \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(U, H_\infty \oplus G_\infty^+)$, define

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty\|_{L_m^{1,p,\delta}(U)} := \|\nabla^{a_\infty} \boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty\|_{L_m^{p,\delta}(U)} + \|\xi_\infty^H\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty^G\|_{L_G^{p,\delta}(U)}. \tag{4.6}$$

When $U = \Sigma$, denote this norm by $\|\cdot\|_{L_m^{1,p,\delta}}$. Define

$$\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\infty = \left\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Sigma, E_\infty^+)_L \mid \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty\|_{L_m^{1,p,\delta}} < \infty\right\}.$$

For convenience we introduce

$$L_H^{1,p,\delta}(U, H_\infty)_L = \left\{\xi_\infty^H \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(U, u_\infty^* H_X)_L \mid \|\xi_\infty^H\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\nabla^{A_\infty} \xi_\infty^H\|_{L_H^{p,\delta}(U)} < +\infty\right\};$$

$$L_G^{1,p,\delta}(U, G_\infty^+)_L = \left\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty^G \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(U, u_\infty^* G_X^+)_L \mid \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty^G\|_{L_G^{p,\delta}(U)} + \|\nabla^{A_\infty} \boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty^G\|_{L_G^{p,\delta}(U)} < +\infty\right\}.$$

Then since ∇ respects the splitting $H_X \oplus G_X$, as Banach spaces, one has

$$\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\infty = L_H^{1,p,\delta}(\Sigma, H_\infty)_L \oplus L_G^{1,p,\delta}(\Sigma, G_\infty^+)_L.$$

Similar to Lemma 4.2, the following lemma which is a consequence of Proposition A.1.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose* $\xi_\infty \in L_m^{1,p,\delta}(\Sigma, E_\infty)_L$.

(a) *There exists* $\xi^H_\infty(\infty) \in H_{L,x_\infty}$, $\xi^H_\infty(z_i) \in H_{X,x_i}$, $i = 1,\dots,m$, $\xi^H_\infty(\underline{z}_j) \in H_{L,x_j}$, $j = 1,\dots,\underline{m}$ *such that*

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} \xi^H_\infty(z) = \xi^H_\infty(\infty);\ \lim_{z\to z_i} \xi^H_\infty(z) = \xi^H_\infty(z_i),\ i = 1,\dots,m+\underline{m}.$$

(b) *The correspondence* $\xi_\infty \mapsto (\xi^H_\infty(\infty), \xi^H_\infty(z_1),\dots,\xi^H_\infty(z_{m+\underline{m}}))$ *is bounded with respect to the norm* $\|\cdot\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_H}$.

(c) *For any* $\xi_{\infty;1},\xi_{\infty;2} \in L^{1,p,\delta}_m(\Sigma, u^*_\infty TX)_L$ *such that* $\xi^H_{\infty;1}$ *and* $\xi^H_{\infty;2}$ *have the same limits at* ∞ *and each* z_i, *one has*

$$\|\xi^H_{\infty;1} - \xi^H_{\infty;2}\|_{L^{p,\delta-1}_{H;c}} < +\infty.$$

Proof. It suffices to check the properties near each puncture z_i. Let U_i be the neighborhood of z_i we took before. We trivialize H_X near x_i and use the smooth map $u_\infty : U_i \to X$ to pull back this trivialization. Since A_∞ is also a connection obtained by pulling back a connection on the bundle $\mu^{-1}(0) \to \bar{X}$, it is easy to see that with respect to the trivialization of $u^*_\infty TX$ over U_i, the connection ∇^{A_∞} differs from the trivial connection by a zero-th order term that is bounded by a multiple of $|z - z_i|$. Then it is easy to see that the norm $L^{1,p,\delta}_H(U_i)$ defined using the connection ∇^{A_∞} is equivalent to the corresponding one using the trivial connection.

Consider the change of coordinate $w_i = x + \boldsymbol{i}y = (z - z_i)^{-1}$. Then by definition, $\rho^H_\infty = |w|^2$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla\xi^H_\infty\|_{L^{p,\delta}_G(U_i)} &= \left[\int_{U_i} |\nabla\xi^H_\infty(z)|^p (\rho^H_\infty(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} (\sigma^H_\infty(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}} ds dt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &= \left[\int_{U_i} |\nabla_w \xi^H_\infty(z)|^p (|w|^2)^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} dx dy\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}.\end{aligned}$$

Here ∇_w is the gradient in the w coordinate. The existence of $\lim_{z\to z_i} \xi^H_\infty(z)$ then follows from Proposition A.1. The existence of the limit at ∞ is by the same reason for affine vortices. The second statement of this lemma also follows from Proposition A.1. □

Lemma 4.5. *For any open subset* $U \subset \Sigma$ *one has*

$$L^{1,p,\delta}_G(U, G^+_\infty) = W^{1,p,\delta}(\overline{U}, G^+_\infty),\ L^{p,\delta}_G(U, G^+_\infty) = L^{p,\delta}(\overline{U}, G^+_\infty),$$

where the Sobolev spaces over the closure $\overline{U}$ *are defined using the Euclidean metric of* $\overline{U} \subset \mathbb{H}$ *and any smooth connection on* G^+_∞, *weighted by the function* ρ^G_∞.

4.2.2. *The linear operators.* Now we consider the deformation theory of $\mathbf{v}_\infty$. As discussed in Subsection 2.2, we should regard u_∞ as the independent variable and A_∞ is the pullback of the connection on $\mu^{-1}(0) \to \bar{X}$ by u_∞. Then modulo gauge transformation, the infinitesimal deformations of u_∞ can be identified with $L^{1,p,\delta}_H(\Sigma, H_\infty)_L$.

Let $\overline{\exp}$ be the exponential map of $h_X|_{\mu^{-1}(0)}$. Then by the property of h_X, it preserves L and we can identify a small ball of $L^{1,p,\delta}_H(\Sigma, H_\infty)_L$ centered at the origin with a Banach

manifold of maps, denoted by $\mathscr{B}^H_\infty$. An element of $\mathscr{B}^H_\infty$ is denoted by u'_∞, with induced connection A'_∞. Lemma 4.4 implies that there are evaluation maps

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{ev}^\infty_\infty &: \mathscr{B}^H_\infty \to \bar{L}, \\ \mathrm{ev}^i_\infty &: \mathscr{B}^H_\infty \to \bar{X},\ 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m, \\ \underline{\mathrm{ev}}^j_\infty &: \mathscr{B}^H_\infty \to \bar{L},\ 1 \leqslant j \leqslant \underline{m}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

On the other hand, consider the Banach vector bundle $\mathscr{E}^H_\infty \to \mathscr{B}^H_\infty$ whose fibre over u'_∞ is

$$\mathscr{E}^H_\infty|_{u'_\infty} := L^{p,\delta}_H(\Sigma, (u'_\infty)^* H_X).$$

Equation (2.4) defines a section $\mathscr{F}^H_\infty : \mathscr{B}^H_\infty \to \mathscr{E}^H_\infty$.

On the other hand, the perturbation term ι restricts to the ∞ component to give another section

$$\iota_\infty : W \times \mathscr{B}^H_\infty \to \mathscr{E}^H_\infty.$$

Define

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}^H_\infty : W \times \mathscr{B}^H_\infty \to \mathscr{E}^H_\infty,\ \widetilde{\mathscr{F}}^H_\infty := \mathscr{F}^H_\infty + \iota_\infty$$

By assumption,

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_\infty(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_\infty) = 0.$$

We use the connection ∇ to trivialize $\mathscr{E}^H_\infty$ near u_∞. Then the linearization of $\mathscr{F}^H_\infty$ at u_∞ is a Fredholm operator

$$d\mathscr{F}^H_\infty(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_\infty) : L^{1,p,\delta}_H(\Sigma, H_\infty)_L \to L^{p,\delta}_H(\Sigma, H_\infty) = \mathscr{E}^H_\infty|_{u_\infty}.$$

On the other hand, the linearization of ι_∞ at $(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_\infty)$ gives the linear operator

$$\ell^H_\infty : W \times L^{1,p,\delta}_H(\Sigma, H_\infty)_L \to L^{p,\delta}_H(\Sigma, H_\infty).$$

Then define

$$\widetilde{D}^H_\infty := d\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}^H_\infty(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_\infty).$$

Now the definitions of $\mathscr{B}^H_\infty$, $\mathscr{E}^H_\infty$, the evaluation maps in (4.7), and the operator $\widetilde{D}^H_\infty : W \times \mathscr{B}^H_\infty \to \mathscr{E}^H_\infty$ complete the statement of the transverality assumption (Hypothesis 3.9).

Indeed $d\mathscr{F}^H_\infty$ it is related to the linearization of the Cauchy-Riemann operator $\overline{\partial}_{A_\infty}$, which reads

$$D_\infty(\xi) = \nabla_s \xi + \nabla_\xi \mathfrak{X}_{\phi_\infty} + (\nabla_\xi J)(\partial_t u_\infty + \mathfrak{X}_{\psi_\infty}) + J(\nabla_t \xi + \nabla_\xi \mathfrak{X}_{\psi_\infty}). \tag{4.8}$$

Using the decomposition $E_\infty = H_\infty \oplus G_\infty$, one can write D_∞ in the block matrix form

$$D_\infty = \begin{bmatrix} D^H_\infty & E^1_\infty \\ E^2_\infty & D^G_\infty \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.9}$$

Then since ∇ preserves the splitting, it is easy to see that $D^H_\infty = d\mathscr{F}^H_\infty(u_\infty)$.

Later we will need the following fact.

Lemma 4.6. *E^1_∞, E^2_∞ define bounded operators*

$$E^1_\infty : L^{1,p,\delta}_G(\Sigma, G_\infty)_L \to L^{p,\delta}_H(\Sigma, H_\infty),\ E^2_\infty : L^{1,p,\delta}_H(H_\infty)_L \to L^{p,\delta}_G(G_\infty).$$

Proof. It is easy to see that E_1^∞ and E_2^∞ are linear in $d_{a_\infty}u_\infty = ds\otimes(\partial_s u_\infty + \mathfrak{X}_{\phi_\infty}) + dt\otimes(\partial_t u_\infty + \mathfrak{X}_{\psi_\infty})$. Therefore, we have the following estimates. First,

$$\|E_2^\infty(\xi_\infty^H)\|_{L_G^{p,\delta}} \leqslant \|\xi_\infty^H\|_{L^\infty}\left[\int_\Sigma |d_{a_\infty}u_\infty(z)|^p(\rho_\infty^G(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

where the integral on the right hand side is finite due to the asymptotic property of (A_∞, u_∞). Second,

$$\|E_1^\infty(\xi_\infty^G)\|_{L_H^{p,\delta}} \leqslant \|d_{a_\infty}u_\infty\|_{L^\infty}\left[\int_U |\xi_\infty^G(z)|^p(\rho_\infty^H(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}(\sigma_\infty^H)^{1-\frac{p}{2}}dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}. \tag{4.10}$$

The first factor on the right hand side is finite. Moreover, inside each $U_{i,1} = B(z_i, r)$,

$$(\rho_\infty^H(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}(\sigma_\infty^H(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}} = |z-z_i|^{-p\delta-4+2p} = 1 = (\rho_\infty^G(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}(\sigma_\infty^G(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}}.$$

Here we used $\delta = 2-\frac{4}{p}$. Outside the union of all $U_{i,1}$'s, $(\rho_\infty^H(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}(\sigma_\infty^H(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}}$ is also comparable to $(\rho_\infty^G(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}(\sigma_\infty^G(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}}$. So the right hand side of (4.10) is bounded by $\|d_{a_\infty}u_\infty\|_{L^\infty(U)}\|\xi_\infty^G\|_{L_G^{p,\delta}(U)}$. □

4.3. **Rescaling of the disk.** After the gluing, the disk component with a rescaling (and a small correction from the implicit function theorem) will become part of an $\mathbb{H}$-vortex. We first need to discuss the relation between the Banach norms and the rescaling.

Let $s_\epsilon : \mathbb{H}\to\mathbb{H}$ be the rescaling map $z\mapsto\epsilon z$. Denote

$$\Sigma_\epsilon := s_\epsilon^{-1}(\Sigma) = \mathbb{H}\smallsetminus\{z_{1,\epsilon},\dots,z_{m,\epsilon},\underline{z}_{1,\epsilon},\dots,\underline{z}_{\underline{m},\epsilon}\}.$$

Then define a gauged map $\mathbf{v}_{\infty,\epsilon} = (A_{\infty,\epsilon}, u_{\infty,\epsilon})$ on Σ_ϵ by

$$A_{\infty,\epsilon} = s_\epsilon^* A_\infty,\ u_{\infty,\epsilon} = s_\epsilon^* u_\infty.$$

4.3.1. *New norms along* $\mathbf{v}_{\infty,\epsilon}$. The deformation theory of the gauged map $\mathbf{v}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ gives the Banach spaces $\hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\infty,\epsilon} := \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\mathbf{v}_{\infty,\epsilon}}$ and $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\infty,\epsilon} := \hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathbf{v}_{\infty,\epsilon}}$. We redefine their norms as follows.

Define $\sigma_{\infty,\epsilon}^H, \rho_{\infty,\epsilon}^H : \Sigma_\epsilon\to[1,+\infty)$ by

$$\sigma_{\infty,\epsilon}^H(z) = \epsilon^2\sigma_\infty^H(\epsilon z),\ \rho_{\infty,\epsilon}^H(z) = \rho_\infty^H(\epsilon z).$$

Here σ_∞^H, ρ_∞^H are defined previously. Introduce another weight function

$$\rho_{\infty,\epsilon}^G(z) = \epsilon^{-1}\rho_\infty^G(\epsilon z).$$

Also denote $\sigma_{\infty,\epsilon}^G \equiv 1$. Then for any open subset $U\subset\Sigma_\epsilon$, any section $f\in L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(U,E)$ of an Euclidean bundle $E\to U$, define

$$\|f\|_{L_{H;\epsilon}^{p,\delta}(U)} := \left[\int_U |f(z)|^p(\rho_{\infty,\epsilon}^H(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}(\sigma_{\infty,\epsilon}^H(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}}dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}};$$

$$\|f\|_{L_{G;\epsilon}^{p,\delta}(U)} := \left[\int_U |f(z)|^p(\rho_{\infty,\epsilon}^G(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}(\sigma_{\infty,\epsilon}^G(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}}dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

For $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\infty,\epsilon} = (\nu_{\infty,\epsilon}^H, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\infty,\epsilon}^G)\in\hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ and $U\subset\Sigma_\epsilon$, define

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L_{m;\epsilon}^{p,\delta}(U)} := \|\nu_{\infty,\epsilon}^H\|_{L_{H;\epsilon}^{p,\delta}(U)} + \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\infty,\epsilon}^G\|_{L_{G;\epsilon}^{p,\delta}(U)}.$$

For $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon} = (\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\xi}^G_{\infty,\epsilon}) \in \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\infty,\epsilon}$, define

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U)} := \|\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(U)} + \|\nabla^{A_{\infty,\epsilon}}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U)} + \|\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty(U)}. \tag{4.11}$$

4.3.2. *Relation with rescaling.* Now we look at the relation with the previous norms under rescaling. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{s}^*_\epsilon : W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Sigma, H_\infty \oplus G^+_\infty) &\to W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Sigma_\epsilon, H_{\infty,\epsilon} \oplus G^+_{\infty,\epsilon}), \\ \check{s}^*_\epsilon : L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Sigma, H_\infty \oplus G_\infty) &\to L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Sigma, H_{\infty,\epsilon} \oplus G^+_{\infty,\epsilon}) \end{aligned}$$

by (notice that $\frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{2}{p} = 1$)

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{s}^*_\epsilon\Big(\xi^H_\infty, \boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\infty\Big) &= \Big(s^*_\epsilon \xi^H_\infty, \epsilon^{\frac{\delta}{2}+\frac{2}{p}} s^*_\epsilon \boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\infty\Big). \\ \check{s}^*_\epsilon\Big(\nu^H_\infty, \boldsymbol{\nu}^G_\infty\Big) &= \Big(\epsilon s^*_\epsilon \nu^H_\infty, \epsilon^{\frac{\delta}{2}+\frac{2}{p}} s^*_\epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu}^G_\infty\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for $\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty = (\xi^H_\infty, \boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\infty) \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Sigma, H_\infty \oplus G^+_\infty)$, define

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{\mathrm{aux};\epsilon}} := \|\xi^H_\infty\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_H} + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\infty\|_{L^{p,\delta}_G} + \epsilon\|\nabla^{A_\infty}\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\infty\|_{L^{p,\delta}_G}. \tag{4.12}$$

By straightforward calculation, one has

Lemma 4.7. *For any $\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty \in \hat{\mathscr{B}}_\infty$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}_\infty \in \hat{\mathscr{C}}_\infty$,*

$$\|\hat{s}^*_\epsilon \boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty\|_{1;\epsilon} = \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{\mathrm{aux};\epsilon}}, \ \|\check{s}^*_\epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu}_\infty\|_{0;\epsilon} = \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_\infty\|_{L^{p,\delta}_m}. \tag{4.13}$$

Proof. Since this lemma is used frequently, we provide the details of the straightforward computation. Denote $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon} = (\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\xi}^G_{\infty,\epsilon}) = \hat{s}^*_\epsilon \boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty = (s^*_\epsilon \xi^H_\infty, \epsilon s^*_\epsilon \boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\infty)$. By the definition of

the norm $\|\cdot\|_{1;\epsilon}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}} &= \left[\int_{\Sigma_\epsilon} |\epsilon\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\infty(\epsilon z)|^p(\rho^G_{\infty,\epsilon}(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}(\sigma^G_{\infty,\epsilon})^{1-\frac{p}{2}}dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
&= \epsilon^{1-\frac{\delta}{2}}\left[\int_{\Sigma,\epsilon} |\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\infty(\epsilon z)|^p(\rho^G_\infty(\epsilon z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}(\sigma^G_\infty(\epsilon z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}}dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
&= \epsilon^{1-\frac{\delta}{2}-\frac{2}{p}}\left[\int_{\Sigma} |\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\infty(z)|^p(\rho^G_\infty(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}(\rho^G_\infty(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}}dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
&= \|\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\infty\|_{L^{p,\delta}_G}.\\
\|\nabla^{a_{\infty,\epsilon}}\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}} &= \left[\int_{\Sigma_\epsilon} |\epsilon^2\nabla^{a_\infty}\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\infty(\epsilon z)|^p(\rho^G_{\infty,\epsilon}(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}(\sigma^G_{\infty,\epsilon}(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}}dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
&= \epsilon\|\nabla^{a_\infty}\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\infty\|_{L^{p,\delta}_G};\\
\|\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty} &= \|\xi^H_\infty\|_{L^\infty};\\
\|\nabla^{a_{\infty,\epsilon}}\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{H;\epsilon}} &= \left[\int_{\Sigma} |\epsilon\nabla^{a_\infty}\xi^H_\infty(\epsilon z)|^p(\rho^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}(\sigma^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}}dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
&= \epsilon\left[\int_{\Sigma_\epsilon} |\nabla^{a_\infty}\xi^H_\infty(\epsilon z)|^p(\rho^H_\infty(\epsilon z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}(\sigma^H_\infty(\epsilon z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}}\epsilon^{2-p}dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
&= \|\nabla^{a_\infty}\xi^H_\infty\|_{L^{p,\delta}_H}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (4.11) and (4.12), the first identity of (4.13) is proved. We left the proof of the second identity of (4.13) to the reader. □

Similar to Lemma 4.4, one has the following lemma, whose proof is left to the reader.

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon} \in \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\infty,\epsilon}$, then there exist $\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(\infty) \in H_{L,x_\infty}$ and for each $i = 1,\ldots,m$ (resp. $j = 1,\ldots,\underline{m}$) there exists $\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z_{i,\epsilon}) \in H_{X,x_i}$ (resp. $\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(\underline{z}_{j,\epsilon}) \in H_{L,\underline{x}_j}$) such that*

$$\lim_{z\to z_{i,\epsilon}} \xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z) = \xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z_{i,\epsilon}),\ \lim_{z\to \underline{z}_{j,\epsilon}} \xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z) = \xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(\underline{z}_{j,\epsilon}),\ \lim_{z\to\infty} \xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z) = \xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(\infty).$$

Moreover, if there are $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon;\gamma} = (\xi_{\infty,\epsilon;\gamma},\phi_{\infty,\epsilon;\gamma},\psi_{\infty,\epsilon;\gamma}) \in \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ ($\gamma = 1,2$) such that $\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon;1}$ and $\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon;2}$ have the same limits at each $z_{i,\epsilon}$, $\underline{z}_{j,\epsilon}$ and ∞, then we have

$$\|\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon;1} - \xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon;2}\|_{L^{p,\delta-1}_{H,c;\epsilon}} < +\infty.$$

4.3.3. *Uniform estimate.* Let $\hat{\mathscr{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ be the linearization of the vortex equation along the gauged map $\mathbf{v}_{\infty,\epsilon}$, which gives a Fredholm map

$$\hat{\mathscr{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon} : \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\infty,\epsilon} \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\infty,\epsilon}.$$

We also rescale the perturbation by introducing

$$\ell_{\infty,\epsilon} : W \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\infty,\epsilon},\ \ell_{\infty,\epsilon}(\mathbf{w}) = \epsilon s^*_\epsilon \ell_\infty(\mathbf{w}).$$

Extend the definition of $\hat{s}_\epsilon^*$ to W by $\hat{s}_\epsilon^*(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}$. Then

$$\iota_{\infty,\epsilon} \circ \hat{s}_\epsilon^* = \check{s}_\epsilon^* \iota_\infty(\mathbf{w}). \tag{4.14}$$

We have the total derivative

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon} := \hat{\mathscr{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon} + \ell_{\infty,\epsilon} : W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\infty,\epsilon} \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\infty,\epsilon}.$$

We intend to prove the following result.

Proposition 4.9. *There exist $\epsilon_4 > 0$ and $c_4 > 0$ such that for all $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_4)$, there exists a bounded right inverse $\widetilde{Q}_{\infty,\epsilon} : \hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\infty,\epsilon} \to W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ to $\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ such that*

$$\|\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_{\infty,\epsilon}\| \leqslant c_4.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.7, it is equivalent to consider the conjugated operator

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\infty^{(\epsilon)} = (\check{s}_\epsilon^*)^{-1} \circ \widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon} \circ \hat{s}_\epsilon^* : W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_\infty \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_\infty$$

where on $\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\infty$ we use the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{\mathrm{aux};\epsilon}}$. Then for $\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty = (\xi_\infty^H, \xi_\infty^G, \phi_\infty, \psi_\infty)$ and $\mathbf{w} \in W$, using (4.14) and the fact that $\iota_\infty(\mathbf{w})$ is contained in $u_\infty^* H_X$, one has

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\infty^{(\epsilon)}(\mathbf{w}, \xi_\infty^H, \xi_\infty^G, \alpha_\infty) = \begin{bmatrix} \iota_\infty(\mathbf{w}) + D_\infty^H(\xi_\infty^H) + E_\infty^1(\xi_\infty^G) \\ \epsilon E_\infty^2(\xi_\infty^H) + \epsilon D_\infty^G(\xi_\infty^G) + L_\infty(\alpha_\infty) \\ L_\infty^*(\xi_\infty^G) + \epsilon \not{D}_\infty^G(\alpha_\infty) \end{bmatrix} \tag{4.15}$$

Here D_∞^H, D_∞^G, E_∞^1, E_∞^2 are the entries of (4.9), while

$$L_\infty(\alpha_\infty) = \mathfrak{X}_{\phi_\infty} + J\mathfrak{X}_{\psi_\infty}, \ L_\infty^*(\xi_\infty^G) = (d\mu(J\xi_\infty^G), d\mu(\xi_\infty^G)).$$

$$\not{D}_\infty^G \alpha = \not{D}_\infty^G(\phi, \psi) = (\partial_s \phi + \partial_t \psi + [\phi_\infty, \phi] + [\psi_\infty, \psi], \partial_s \psi - \partial_t \phi + [\phi_\infty, \psi] - [\psi_\infty, \phi]).$$

By Lemma 4.6, E_∞^1 and E_∞^2 are bounded operators, and the operator $(\mathbf{w}, \xi_\infty^H) \mapsto \widetilde{D}_\infty(\mathbf{w}, \xi_\infty^H)$ has a bounded right inverse, this proposition follows from Lemma 4.10 below. □

Lemma 4.10. *There exist $c_5 > 0$ and $\epsilon_5 > 0$ such that for all $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_5)$, the operator*

$$\hat{D}_\infty^G : L^{1,p,\delta}_{\mathrm{aux};\epsilon}(u_\infty^* G_X^+) \to L_G^{p,\delta}(u_\infty^* G_X^+),$$

defined by

$$\hat{D}_\infty^G(\xi_\infty^G, \alpha_\infty) = \Big(\epsilon D_\infty^G(\xi_\infty) + L_\infty(\alpha_\infty), \epsilon \not{D}_\infty^G(\alpha_\infty) + L_\infty^*(\xi_\infty^G)\Big)$$

is invertible and for all $\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty^G \in L^{1,p,\delta}_{\mathrm{aux};\epsilon}(u_\infty^* G_X^+)$,

$$c_5 \|\hat{D}_\infty^G(\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty^G)\|_{L_G^{p,\delta}} \geqslant \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty^G\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{\mathrm{aux};\epsilon}}.$$

4.3.4. *Proof of Lemma 4.10.* Since a_∞ is smooth over the punctures, the operator $\hat{D}^G_\infty$ has smooth coefficients in the Euclidean coordinates of $\mathbb{H}$. Moreover, by Lemma 4.5, the norm of $L^{1,p,\delta}_{\mathrm{aux};\epsilon}(u^*_\infty G^+_X)$ given by (4.12) is equivalent to the one defined by replacing ∇^{a_∞} by a smooth connection on $u^*_\infty G^+_X$. Hence we can ignore the punctures.

Take $k \geqslant 1$ and abbreviate

$$\mathscr{B}^1 = W^{1,p,\delta}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{C}^k)_R,\ \mathscr{B}^2 = L^{p,\delta}(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{C}^k),$$

where the subscript R means the boundary values are required to be real.

Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 : \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}^{2k\times 2k}$ be bounded continuous maps, which define zero-th order operators $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 : \mathscr{B}^1 \to \mathscr{B}^2$. Denote

$$\hat{D}_\gamma : \mathscr{B}^1 \oplus \mathscr{B}^1 \to \mathscr{B}^2 \oplus \mathscr{B}^2,\ \hat{D}_\gamma(f_1, f_2) = (\partial_{\bar{z}} f_1 + \gamma_1(f_1) + f_2, \partial_z f_2 + \gamma_2(f_2) + f_1).$$

Here ∂_z, $\partial_{\bar{z}}$ are partial derivatives in the standard flat coordinate of $\mathbb{H}$.

Lemma 4.11. *When $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0$, $\hat{D}_\gamma : \mathscr{B}^1 \oplus \mathscr{B}^1 \to \mathscr{B}^2 \oplus \mathscr{B}^2$ is an invertible operator.*

Proof. In this case denote the operator by $\hat{D}$. It is a standard fact that $\hat{D}$ is Fredholm, and it is a bit more effort to check that its index is zero. Hence it remains to show that $\hat{D}$ has trivial kernel. Indeed, it is easy to see that $\mathscr{B}^1 \subset L^2(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{C}^k)$, and any $(f_1, f_2) \in \ker \hat{D}$ is smooth. Then

$$\hat{D}^\dagger \hat{D}(f_1, f_2) = (-\Delta f_1 + f_1, -\Delta f_2 + f_2) = (0, 0).$$

However, since $-\Delta + \mathrm{Id}$ is positive on L^2, $f_1 = f_2 = 0$. □

Lemma 4.12. *Consider the operator $\hat{D}^{(\epsilon)}_\gamma : \mathscr{B}^1 \oplus \mathscr{B}^1 \to \mathscr{B}^2 \oplus \mathscr{B}^2$ defined by*

$$\hat{D}^{(\epsilon)}_\gamma(f_1, f_2) = (\epsilon\partial_{\bar{z}} f_1 + \epsilon\gamma_1(f_1) + f_2, \epsilon\partial_z f_2 + \epsilon\gamma_2(f_2) + f_1). \tag{4.16}$$

Then there exist $\epsilon(\gamma) > 0$ and $c(\gamma) > 0$ such that for all $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon(\gamma)]$, there is a bounded right inverse Q^ϵ_γ of $\hat{D}^{(\epsilon)}_\gamma$ such that

$$\|Q^\epsilon_\gamma(h_1, h_2)\|_{L^{p,\delta}_G} + \epsilon\|\nabla Q^\epsilon_\gamma(h_1, h_2)\|_{L^{p,\delta}_G} \leqslant c\|(h_1, h_2)\|_{L^{p,\delta}_G},\ \forall (h_1, h_2) \in \mathscr{B}^2 \oplus \mathscr{B}^2.$$

Proof. For $k = 0, 1$, define the new norms

$$\|f\|_{k,\delta;\epsilon} = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \epsilon^i \|\nabla^k f\|_{L^{p,\delta}}. \tag{4.17}$$

We first prove the lemma for $\delta = 0$. Denote $f_\epsilon(z) = (s^*_\epsilon f)(z) = f(\epsilon z)$. Then

$$\|f_\epsilon\|_{W^{k,p}} = \epsilon^{-\frac{2}{p}} \|f\|_{k;\epsilon}$$

Denote $\gamma^\epsilon = (\gamma^\epsilon_1, \gamma^\epsilon_2)$ where $\gamma^\epsilon_1(z) = \gamma_1(\epsilon z)$, $\gamma^\epsilon_2(z) = \gamma_2(\epsilon z)$. Then $s^*_\epsilon \circ \hat{D}^{(\epsilon)}_\gamma = \hat{D}_{\epsilon\gamma^\epsilon} \circ s^*_\epsilon$. Then by Lemma 4.11, there is a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\hat{D}^{(\epsilon)}_\gamma(f_1, f_2)\|_{L^p} = \|\hat{D}^{(\epsilon)}_\gamma(f_1, f_2)\|_{0,0;\epsilon} = \|(s^*_\epsilon)^{-1}\hat{D}_{\epsilon\gamma^\epsilon}(f_{1,\epsilon}, f_{2,\epsilon})\|_{0,0;\epsilon} \\
&= \epsilon^{\frac{2}{p}}\|\hat{D}_{\epsilon\gamma^\epsilon}(f_{1,\epsilon}, f_{2,\epsilon})\|_{L^p} \geqslant \epsilon^{\frac{2}{p}}\left[\frac{1}{c} - \epsilon\|\gamma\|_{L^\infty}\right]\|(f_{1,\epsilon}, f_{2,\epsilon})\|_{W^{1,p}} = \left[\frac{1}{c} - \epsilon\|\gamma\|_{L^\infty}\right]\|(f_1, f_2)\|_{1,0;\epsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then for $\epsilon \leqslant (2c\|a\|_{L^\infty})^{-1}$, one has

$$\|\hat{D}_\gamma^{(\epsilon)}(f_1,f_2)\|_{0,0;\epsilon} \geqslant \frac{1}{2c}\|(f_1,f_2)\|_{1,0;\epsilon}.$$

Therefore $\hat{D}_\gamma^{(\epsilon)}$ has trivial kernel. Moreover, since its index is zero, there is a bounded inverse Q_γ^ϵ whose norm is bounded by $2c$. Hence the $\delta = 0$ case is proved.

Now we show that the $\delta = 0$ case implies the general case. Indeed, the map $f \mapsto [\rho_\infty^G]^{-\delta} f$ induces isomorphisms between the $W^{k,p}$-norm and the new norm (4.17). Then it is equivalent to consider the operator

$$\begin{aligned} W^{1,p} \ni f \mapsto (\rho_\infty^G)^\delta \hat{D}_\gamma^{(\epsilon)}\Big([\rho_\infty^G]^{-\delta} f_1, [\rho_\infty^G]^{-\delta} f_2\Big) \\ = \hat{D}_\gamma^{(\epsilon)}(f_1,f_2) - \epsilon\Big([\rho_\infty^G]^\delta(\partial_{\bar{z}}[\rho_\infty^G]^{-\delta}) f_1, [\rho_\infty^G]^\delta(\partial_z[\rho_\infty^G]^{-\delta}) f_2\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Since $[\rho_\infty^G]^\delta \nabla [\rho_\infty^G]^{-\delta}$ is bounded, the last term is a bounded operator from $W^{1,p}$ to L^p. Hence when ϵ is sufficiently small, the conclusion follows from the $\delta = 0$ case. □

Now we are ready to prove Lemma 4.10. We left to the reader to check that the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L_G^{p,\delta}}$ defined using the connection form a_∞ is equivalent to the norm defined for $a_\infty = 0$. Moreover, it is easy to see

$$D_\infty^G(\mathfrak{X}_{\eta_1} + J\mathfrak{X}_{\zeta_1}) = L_\infty\Big[\partial_{\overline{z}}(\eta_1 + \boldsymbol{i}\zeta_1) + \gamma_1(\eta_1 + \boldsymbol{i}\zeta_1)\Big]$$

$$\not{D}_\infty^G(\eta_2 + \boldsymbol{i}\zeta_2) = \partial_z(\eta_2 + \boldsymbol{i}\zeta_2) + \gamma_2(\eta_2 + \boldsymbol{i}\zeta_2).$$

Here γ_1 and γ_2 are uniformly bounded matrix valued continuous maps. Therefore, $\hat{D}_\infty^G$ is of the same form as $\hat{D}_\gamma^{(\epsilon)}$ in (4.16). Then by Lemma 4.12, for ϵ_5 sufficiently small and $\epsilon \in (0,\epsilon_5)$, the operator $\hat{D}_\infty^G$ is uniformly invertible with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{\mathrm{aux};\epsilon}}$ on the domain and the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L_G^{p,\delta}}$ on the target. This proves Lemma 4.10.

4.4. **Matching condition.** Consider the space of infinitesimal deformations of the singular configurations, i.e.,

$$\hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\#,\epsilon} := \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\infty,\epsilon} \times \prod_{i=1}^{\underline{m}+m} \hat{\mathscr{B}}_i,$$

and the one with the matching condition imposed

$$\hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\Delta,\epsilon} := \Big\{(\xi_\infty^H, \boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{m+\underline{m}}) \in \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\#,\epsilon} \mid \mathrm{ev}_\infty^i(\xi_\infty^H) = \mathrm{ev}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i),\ i = 1,\dots,m+\underline{m}.\Big\}.$$

Introduce

$$\hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\Delta,\epsilon} := \hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\infty,\epsilon} \times \prod_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \hat{\mathscr{E}}_i,$$

Recall that we have three operators associated with the disk component $\mathbf{v}_\infty$, which are

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{D}_\infty^H &: W \times \mathscr{B}_\infty^H \to \mathscr{E}_\infty^H, \\ \widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon} &: W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\infty,\epsilon} \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\infty,\epsilon}, \\ \widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\infty^{(\epsilon)} &: W \times L^{1,p,\delta}_{\mathrm{aux};\epsilon}(u_\infty^* H_X \oplus u_\infty^* E_X^+) \to L_m^{p,\delta}(u_\infty^* H_X \oplus u_\infty^* E_X^+). \end{aligned}$$

The transversality assumption Hypothesis 3.9 assumes that $\widetilde{D}^H_\infty$ is surjective, hence has a bounded right inverse. We need to construct an induced right inverse to $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon}$.

Lemma 4.13. *There exists a bounded operator $m^*_\epsilon : \ker(\widetilde{D}^H_\infty) \to W \times \hat{\mathcal{B}}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ satisfying*

$$\|m^*_\epsilon\| \leqslant c,\ (\hat{s}^*_\epsilon + \epsilon m^*_\epsilon)\big[\ker(\widetilde{D}^H_\infty)\big] = \ker(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon})$$

Proof. By (4.15), one can write $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}^{(\epsilon)}_\infty = \check{s}^{-1}_\epsilon \circ \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon} \circ \hat{s}^*_\epsilon$ in the block matrix form as

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}^{(\epsilon)}_\infty = \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{D}^H_\infty & E_1 \\ \epsilon E_2 & \hat{D}^G_\infty \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 4.10, $\hat{D}^G_\infty$ has uniformly bounded inverse $\hat{Q}^G_\infty$. Moreover, E_1 and E_2 are of zero-th order, and they are also uniformly bounded. Since $\widetilde{D}^H_\infty$ is surjective, for ϵ small enough, there exists a bounded right inverse $Q^H_{\infty,\epsilon}$ to the operator $\widetilde{D}^H_\infty - \epsilon E_1 \hat{Q}^G_\infty E_2$ whose norm is uniformly bounded. Denote

$$a^*_\epsilon := \hat{s}^*_\epsilon \circ \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{Id} & 0 \\ -\epsilon \hat{Q}^G_\infty E_2 & \mathrm{Id} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Q^H_{\infty,\epsilon} \widetilde{D}^H_\infty & 0 \\ 0 & \mathrm{Id} \end{bmatrix}$$

Then one has

$$\begin{aligned}(\check{s}^*_\epsilon)^{-1} \circ \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon} \circ a^*_\epsilon &= \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{D}^H_\infty & E_1 \\ \epsilon E_2 & \hat{D}^G_\infty \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{Id} & 0 \\ -\epsilon \hat{Q}^G_\infty E_2 & \mathrm{Id} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Q^H_{\infty,\epsilon} \widetilde{D}^H_\infty & 0 \\ 0 & \mathrm{Id} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{D}^H_\infty - \epsilon E_1 \hat{Q}^G_\infty E_2 & E_1 \\ 0 & \hat{D}^G_\infty \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} Q^H_{\infty,\epsilon} \widetilde{D}^H_\infty & 0 \\ 0 & \mathrm{Id} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{D}^H_\infty & E_1 \\ 0 & \hat{D}^G_\infty \end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

So $a^*_\epsilon : \ker[\widetilde{D}^H_\infty] \oplus \{0\} \to \ker[\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon}]$ is an isomorphism. Moreover, it is easy to see that $a^*_\epsilon - \hat{s}^*_\epsilon$ is bounded by a multiple of ϵ. Hence m^*_ϵ can be defined as

$$m^*_\epsilon := \frac{1}{\epsilon}(a^*_\epsilon - s^*_\epsilon).$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma. □

By Hypothesis 3.9, the map

$$\ker[\widetilde{D}^H_\infty] \times \prod_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \ker[\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_i] \to \prod_{i=1}^{m} [T_{\bar{x}_i} \bar{X}]^2 \times \prod_{j=1}^{\underline{m}} [T_{\bar{x}_j} \bar{L}]^2 \times W^{m+\underline{m}+1} \tag{4.18}$$

is transverse to the diagonal. Lemma 4.13 shows that replacing $\ker(\widetilde{D}^H_\infty)$ by $\ker(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon})$ is only a small perturbation of the map (4.18). Hence for all small ϵ, one can choose a right inverse

$$\mathsf{Q}_\epsilon : \frac{W^{m+\underline{m}+1}}{\Delta(W)} \times \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{[T_{\bar{x}_i} \bar{X}]^2}{\Delta(T_{\bar{x}_i} \bar{X})} \times \prod_{j=1}^{\underline{m}} \frac{[T_{\bar{\underline{x}}_j} \bar{L}]^2}{\Delta(T_{\bar{\underline{x}}_j} \bar{L})} \to \ker[\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon}] \times \prod_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \ker[\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_i]$$

whose norm is uniformly bounded. This gives a right inverse

$$\mathsf{Q}_\epsilon : \prod_{i=1}^{m} \frac{[T_{\bar{x}_i}\bar{L}]^2}{\Delta(T_{\bar{x}_i}\bar{L})} \times \prod_{j=1}^{\underline{m}} \frac{[T_{\underline{\bar{x}}_j}\bar{X}]^2}{\Delta(T_{\underline{\bar{x}}_j}\bar{X})} \to \ker[\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon}] \times \prod_{i=1}^{\underline{s}+s} \ker[\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_i].$$

Moreover, Hypothesis 3.9 implies that one has bounded right inverses

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_i : \hat{\mathscr{E}}_i \to W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_i.$$

Together with the right inverse $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ provided by Proposition 4.9, one obtain right inverses

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_{\#,\epsilon} : \hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\infty,\epsilon} \times \prod_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \hat{\mathscr{E}}_i \to \big(W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\infty,\epsilon}\big) \times \prod_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \big(W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_i\big).$$

for all ϵ small enough, whose norm is uniformly bounded. Then one can use Q_ϵ to correct the discrepancies of $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_{\#,\epsilon}$. Since the norm of Q_ϵ is also bounded uniformly, one actually has the following proposition.

Proposition 4.14. *There exist $c_\Delta > 0$, $\epsilon_\Delta \in (0, \epsilon_1)$ and for each $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_\Delta)$, a bounded right operator*

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_{\Delta,\epsilon} : \hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\infty,\epsilon} \times \prod_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \hat{\mathscr{E}}_i \to W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\Delta,\epsilon}$$

which is a right inverse to the operator $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{\Delta,\epsilon}$ and $\|\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_{\Delta,\epsilon}\| \leqslant c_\Delta$. Moreover, as maps between two fixed topological vector spaces (with varying norms), $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_{\Delta,\epsilon}$ varies continuously with ϵ.

The operator $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_{\Delta,\epsilon}$ will be used to construct right inverses along approximate solutions which we construct in the following section.

5. Gluing III: Construction

In this section we use the standard idea of gluing to construct perturbed $\mathbb{H}$-vortices near the singular solution. Though the idea has been very old, on the technical level one still has to do delicate estimate. Here we make a simplifying assumption, i.e., we assume that the index of the problem is zero. Namely, given the transversality hypothesis, there is only a single object $(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{x}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\circ)$ we need to glue. This will greatly simplify the notation and will be sufficient to apply to the project of open quantum Kirwan map ([22]). For the general (higher index) case, what one has to do is to extend all the estimates (not including those in Section 4) to a family of singular objects near $(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{x}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\circ)$, uniformly. We will also remark specifically after each major estimate on such uniform extensions.

The remaining of this section is organized as follows. In Subsection 5.1 we describe how to subdivide the domain and introduce the cut-off functions. In Subsection 5.2 we construct the approximate solutions. In Subsection 5.3 we introduce the ϵ-dependent weighted Sobolev norms along the approximate solutions. In Subsection 5.4 we state the major estimates required to apply the implicit function theorem, which immediately implies the (set-theoretic) construction of the gluing map. In Subsection 5.5 we prove that the gluing map is locally a homeomorphism. In Subsection 5.6, 5.7, 5.8 we prove the major estimates stated in Subsection 5.4.

We will establish several estimates in which we prove the existence of constants $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \ldots, > 0$ and $c_1, c_2, \ldots, > 0$. We will always assume

$$\epsilon_1 \geqslant \epsilon_2 \geqslant \epsilon_3 \geqslant \cdots, \ c_1 \leqslant c_2 \leqslant c_3 \leqslant \cdots.$$

5.1. **Decomposing the domain.** For ϵ sufficiently small, denote

$$\Sigma_\epsilon := \mathbb{H} \smallsetminus \{z_{1;\epsilon}, \ldots, z_{m+\underline{m};\epsilon}\}.$$

Take a number $b > 0$ such that

$$100c_\Delta \leqslant \log b \leqslant 1000c_\Delta \tag{5.1}$$

where c_Δ is the bound of the right inverse $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\Delta$ given by Proposition 4.14. Then define

$$\begin{aligned}
B^i_{\epsilon;0} &= B\left(z_{i;\epsilon}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right); \\
B^i_{\epsilon;l} &= B\left(z_{i;\epsilon}, \frac{lb}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right), \ l = 1, 2; \\
B^i_{\epsilon;l} &= B\left(z_{i;\epsilon}, \frac{1}{(-l)b\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right), \ l = -1, -2; \\
\Sigma_{\epsilon;l} &:= \mathbb{H} \smallsetminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} B^i_{\epsilon;l}, \ l = -2, -1, 0, 1, 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\beta : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ be a smooth cut-off function such that

$$\beta|_{(-\infty,-1]} \equiv 1, \ \beta|_{[0,+\infty)} = 0, \ |\nabla\beta| \leqslant 2.$$

Then for a given gluing parameter ϵ and i, define $\beta_{i,\epsilon} : \mathbb{H} \to [0, 1]$ by

$$\beta_{i,\epsilon}(z) = \beta\left(\frac{\log|z - z_{i,\epsilon}| + \log b + \log\sqrt{\epsilon}}{\log 2}\right).$$

Define $\beta_{\infty,\epsilon} : \mathbb{H} \to [0, 1]$ by

$$\beta_{\infty,\epsilon}(z) = \beta\left(\frac{-\log|z - z_{i,\epsilon}| + \log b - \log\sqrt{\epsilon}}{\log 2}\right).$$

Then $\beta_{i,\epsilon}$ equals to one inside $B^i_{\epsilon;-2}$ and equals to zero outside $B^i_{\epsilon;-1}$. $\beta_{\infty,\epsilon}$ equals to one inside $\Sigma_{\epsilon;2}$ and equals to zero outside $\Sigma_{\epsilon;1}$. We see that

$$\|\nabla\beta_{i,\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty} \leqslant \frac{2b\sqrt{\epsilon}}{\log 2}\sup|\nabla\beta| \leqslant 2b\sqrt{\epsilon}, \ \|\nabla\beta_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty} \leqslant \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{b\log 2}\sup|\nabla\beta| \leqslant \frac{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{b}. \tag{5.2}$$

5.2. **The approximate solution.** For each ϵ small enough, we would like to define a gauged map $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon = (u_\epsilon, \phi_\epsilon, \psi_\epsilon)$ on $\mathbb{H}$ from the components $\mathbf{v}_i$ and $\mathbf{v}_\infty$.

We first need to change the gauge of $\mathbf{v}_\infty$. Let (r_i, θ_i) be the polar coordinates centered at z_i. Let $\mathbb{k}_\infty : \mathbb{H} \smallsetminus \{z_1, \ldots, z_m\} \to K$ be a gauge transformation satisfying the following conditions

(a) For $i = 1, \ldots, m$, $\mathbb{k}_\infty(r_i, \theta_i) = e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i}$ in a small neighborhood of z_i.

(b) $\hbar_\infty$ equals identity outside a compact subset of $\mathbb{H}$ and

$$\frac{\partial \hbar_\infty}{\partial t}|_{\partial\mathbb{H}} = 0.$$

By abuse of notations, we replace $\mathbf{v}_\infty$ by $\hbar_\infty \cdot \mathbf{v}_\infty = (\hbar_\infty \cdot u_\infty, \hbar_\infty \cdot a_\infty)$, in which the connection form a_∞ has poles at z_i for $i = 1, \dots, m$. For convenience, define $\lambda_{m+j} = \underline{\lambda}_j = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, \underline{m}$. Then it is easy to see

$$\lim_{z\to z_i} e^{\lambda_i\theta_i} u_\infty(z) = x_i,\ i = 1, \dots, m + \underline{m}.$$

Moreover, one has the boundary condition

$$u_\infty(\partial\Sigma) \subset L,\ *a_\infty|_{\partial\Sigma} = 0.$$

As before, $\mathbf{v}_{\infty,\epsilon} = (u_{\infty,\epsilon}, a_{\infty,\epsilon}) = s_\epsilon^* \mathbf{v}_\infty$ is the rescaled gauged map defined on Σ_ϵ, which has poles at $z_{i,\epsilon}$. The original (smooth) gauged map is denoted by $\check{\mathbf{v}}_\infty = (\check{u}_\infty, \check{\alpha}_\infty)$.

Over the neck region $A^i_{\epsilon;2} = B^i_{\epsilon;2} \smallsetminus B^i_{\epsilon;-2}$ with polar coordinates (r_i, θ_i), denote $\check{\alpha}_i = e^{\lambda_i\theta_i} \cdot \alpha_i$. Then define

$$\alpha_\epsilon = \begin{cases} \alpha_{\infty,\epsilon}(z), & z \in \Sigma_{\epsilon;2}; \\ e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i} \cdot \Big[\beta_{\infty,\epsilon}\check{\alpha}_{\infty,\epsilon}(r_i,\theta_i) + \beta_{i,\epsilon}\check{\alpha}_i(r_i,\theta_i)\Big], & z \in A^i_{\epsilon;2},\ i = 1, \dots, m + \underline{m}; \\ \alpha_i(z - z_{i,\epsilon}), & z \in B^i_{\epsilon;-2}. \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

Secondly, over the neck region $A^i_{\epsilon;2}$ we also write $\check{u}_i = e^{\lambda_i\theta_i} u_i$. Moreover, around each x_i, choosing a smooth local coordinate $y^1, \dots, y^{2n}$ satisfying two conditions: 1) $\mu^{-1}(0)$ is given by $y^1 = y^2 = \cdots = y^m = 0$; 2) if $i \geqslant m+1$, then L is given by $y^1 = y^2 = \ldots, y^{m'} = 0$. Here $m = \dim\mu^{-1}(0)$ and $m' = \dim L$. Then using this coordinate system we identify

$$\check{u}_{\infty,\epsilon}(z_{i,\epsilon} + r_i e^{\boldsymbol{i}\theta_i}) = \check{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}(r_i,\theta_i),\ \check{u}_i(r_i,\theta_i) = \check{\xi}_i(r_i,\theta_i),\ \frac{1}{2b\sqrt{\epsilon}} \leqslant r_i \leqslant \frac{2b}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}.$$

where $\check{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ and $\check{\xi}_i$ are $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$-valued. Define

$$u_\epsilon(z) = \begin{cases} u_{\infty,\epsilon}(z), & z \in \Sigma_{\epsilon;2}; \\ e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i}\Big[\beta_{\infty,\epsilon}\check{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}(r_i,\theta_i) + \beta_{i,\epsilon}\check{\xi}_i(r_i,\theta_i)\Big], & z \in A^i_{\epsilon;2},\ i = 1, \dots, m + \underline{m}; \\ u_i(z - z_{i,\epsilon}), & z \in B^i_{\epsilon;-2}. \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

Here in the middle line, "+" is the addition in $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$.

Finally define $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon = (u_\epsilon, \alpha_\epsilon)$. Notice that

$$\mathbf{v}_\epsilon|_{A^i_{\epsilon;1}} = (e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i} x_i, \lambda_i d\theta_i) =: \mathbf{c}_i,\ \forall i = 1, \dots, m + \underline{m}.$$

For convenience, we also introduce gauged maps

$$\mathbf{v}'_{i,\epsilon} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_\epsilon, & \text{on } B^i_{\epsilon;0}, \\ \mathbf{c}_i, & \text{on } \mathbb{A}_i \smallsetminus B^i_{\epsilon;0}; \end{cases} \quad \mathbf{v}'_{\infty,\epsilon} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{v}_\epsilon, & \text{on } \Sigma_{\epsilon;0}, \\ \mathbf{c}_i, & \text{on } B^i_{\epsilon;0} \smallsetminus \{z_{i,\epsilon}\},\ i = 1, \dots, m + \underline{m}. \end{cases}$$

By straightforward estimate, one has

Lemma 5.1. *If we identify $\mathbf{v}'_{i,\epsilon}$ with a point $\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{i,\epsilon} \in \hat{\mathcal{B}}_i$ and identify $\mathbf{v}'_{\infty,\epsilon}$ with a point $\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{\infty,\epsilon} \in \hat{\mathcal{B}}_{\infty,\epsilon}$, then*

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{i,\epsilon}\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_m} = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}} = 0.$$

Remark 5.2. The construction of $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon$ can be easily extended to the case of a family of objects in the lower stratum, to obtain a family of approximate solutions. To extend Lemma 5.1 to a uniform estimate for this family, one uses the uniform version of Lemma 4.1 proved in [15].

5.3. **The weighted norms.** One use formula (4.2) to define a Banach space $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}$ of infinitesimal deformations of $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon$, where we replace A_i by A_ϵ. Using the exponential map of the metric h_X one can identify a small ball of $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}$ with a Banach manifold $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_\epsilon$ of triples $\mathbf{v}'_\epsilon = (u'_\epsilon, \phi'_\epsilon, \psi'_\epsilon)$ near $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon$. We also define the Banach vector bundle $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\epsilon \to \hat{\mathcal{B}}_\epsilon$ whose fibre over $\mathbf{v}'_\epsilon$ is the space $L^{p,\delta}(\mathbb{H}, E^+_{u'_\epsilon})$.

However, to obtain uniform estimates one has to modify the norms on $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_\epsilon$.

Define the four functions $\sigma^H_\epsilon, \sigma^G_\epsilon, \rho^H_\epsilon, \rho^G_\epsilon$ as

$$\Big[\sigma^H_\epsilon(z), \rho^H_\epsilon(z), \sigma^G_\epsilon(z), \rho^G_\epsilon(z)\Big] = \begin{cases} \Big[1, \rho_i(z), 1, \rho_i(z)\Big], & z \in B^i_{\epsilon;0}; \\ \Big[\sigma^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z), \rho^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z), \sigma^G_{\infty,\epsilon}, \rho^G_{\infty,\epsilon}(z)\Big], & z \in \Sigma_{\epsilon;0}, \end{cases} \tag{5.5}$$

These are all continuous and on $\partial B^i_{\epsilon;0}$, they have values $[1, \epsilon^{-1}, 1, \epsilon^{-1}]$.

Then for $U \subset \mathbb{H}$ and a section $f \in L^p_{\mathrm{loc}}(U, E)$ of an Euclidean bundle $E \to U$, define

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{H;\epsilon}(U)} = \left[\int_U |f(z)|^p (\rho^H_\epsilon(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} (\sigma^H_\epsilon(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}} dz d\bar{z}\right]^{\frac{1}{p}};$$

$$\|f\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(U)} = \left[\int_U |f(z)|^p (\rho^G_\epsilon(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} (\sigma^G_\epsilon(z))^{1-\frac{p}{2}} dz d\bar{z}\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The following lemma shows that the above two norms are actually equivalent. This fact is useful in many estimates.

Lemma 5.3. *There exist c_1 and ϵ_1 such that for all $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_1)$ and $z \in \mathbb{H}$,*

$$\frac{1}{c_1}[\rho^G_\epsilon(z)]^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} [\rho^G_\epsilon(z)]^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \leqslant [\rho^H_\epsilon(z)]^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} [\sigma^H_\epsilon(z)]^{1-\frac{p}{2}} \leqslant c_1 [\rho^G_\epsilon(z)]^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} [\rho^G_\epsilon(z)]^{1-\frac{p}{2}}.$$

Proof. By definition, for $z \in B^i_{\epsilon;0}$, we have $\rho^G_\epsilon(z) = \rho^H_\epsilon(z)$, $\sigma^G_\epsilon(z) = \sigma^H_\epsilon(z)$. For $z \in \Sigma_{\epsilon;0}$,

$$[\rho^G_\epsilon(z)]^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} [\sigma^G_\epsilon(z)]^{1-\frac{p}{2}} = \epsilon^{-\frac{p\delta}{2}} [\rho^G_\infty(\epsilon z)]^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}$$

while

$$[\rho^H_\epsilon(z)]^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} [\sigma^H_\epsilon(z)]^{1-\frac{p}{2}} = \epsilon^{2-p} [\rho^H_\infty(\epsilon z)]^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} [\sigma^H_\infty(\epsilon z)]^{1-\frac{p}{2}}.$$

When $\epsilon z \notin U_1$, $\sigma^H_\infty(\epsilon z)$ is comparable to a constant and $\rho^H_\infty(\epsilon z)$ and $\rho^G_\infty(\epsilon z)$ are both comparable to $|\epsilon z|^2$. When $\epsilon z \in U_{i,1}$, $\rho^G_\infty(\epsilon z)$ is comparable to a constant and

$$[\rho^\infty_H(\epsilon z)]^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} [\sigma^H_\infty(\epsilon z)]^{1-\frac{p}{2}} = |\epsilon z - w_i|^{-p\delta-4+2p}.$$

This lemma then follows from the condition that $1 = \frac{2}{p} + \frac{\delta}{2}$. □

For $\eta_\epsilon \in L^p_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{H}, u_\epsilon^* TX)$, we can decompose the restriction of η_ϵ on $\Sigma_{\epsilon;0}$ into the components η_ϵ^G and η_ϵ^H. For any $U \subset \mathbb{H}$, define

$$\|\eta_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U)} := \sum_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \|\eta_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_m(B^i_{\epsilon;0}\cap U)} + \|\eta^H_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{H;\epsilon}(\Sigma_{\epsilon;0}\cap U)} + \|\eta^G_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(\Sigma_{\epsilon;0}\cap U)}. \tag{5.6}$$

Here we identify $B^i_{\epsilon;0} \cap U$ as a subset of $\mathbb{A}_i$. But indeed, Lemma 5.3 shows that it is equivalent to either $\|\cdot\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{H;\epsilon}(U)}$ or $\|\cdot\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(U)}$. Then for $\boldsymbol{\nu}_\epsilon = (\nu_\epsilon, \kappa_\epsilon, \varsigma_\epsilon) \in \hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}$, define

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U)} = \|\nu_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U)} + \|\kappa_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(U)} + \|\varsigma_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(U)}.$$

When $U = \mathbb{H}$, this norm is abbreviated by $\|\cdot\|_{0;\epsilon}$ and $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}$ with the new norm $\|\cdot\|_{0;\epsilon}$ is denoted by $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon$.

For $\boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon = (\xi_\epsilon, \alpha_\epsilon) \in \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}$ and $U \subset \mathbb{H}$, define

$$\begin{aligned}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U)} := {} & \|\alpha_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(U)} + \|d\mu(\xi)\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(U)} + \|d\mu(J\xi)\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(U)} \\ & + \left\|\nabla^{A_\epsilon}\boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon\right\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U)} + \|\xi_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

When $U = \mathbb{H}$, we abbreviate the norm by $\|\cdot\|_{1;\epsilon}$. The space $\hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}$ with the new norm is denoted by $\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon$.

We need the following uniform Sobolev estimate.

Lemma 5.4. *There exist c_2 and ϵ_2 such that for all $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_2)$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon \in \hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon$, one has $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty} \leqslant c_2\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon}$.*

Proof. Left to the reader. □

5.4. **The implicit function theorem.**

5.4.1. *The failure.* Consider the perturbed vortex equation over $\mathbb{H}$, where the perturbation term ι also depends on the gluing parameter ϵ,

$$\partial_s u + \mathfrak{X}_\phi + J_X(\partial_t u + \mathfrak{X}_\psi) + \iota_\epsilon(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) = 0,\ \partial_s\psi - \partial_t\phi + [\phi, \psi] + \mu(u) = 0.$$

We use $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon$ as a reference to define the local gauge fixing condition. Hence this gives a section

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_\epsilon : W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon.$$

Let the original perturbation data be $\mathbf{w}_\circ = (\mathbf{p}_\circ, \mathbf{a}_\circ) \in W_{\rm per} \times W_{\rm def}$. Then $(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon)$ is our approximate solution to the equation $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_\epsilon(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) = 0$. The first major estimate is for the norm $\|\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_\epsilon(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\|_{0;\epsilon}$.

Proposition 5.5. *Suppose $1 - \frac{\delta}{2} - \frac{2}{p} = 0$. Then there exists $\epsilon_3 > 0$ such that for all $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_3)$ and all $\tau \in (0, 1 - \frac{2}{p})$, $b \in [e^{100c_\Delta}, 1/2\sqrt{\epsilon}]$, there exists $c_3(a, \tau) > 0$ such that for all*

$$\|\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_\epsilon(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\|_{0;\epsilon} \leqslant c_3(a, \tau)(\sqrt{\epsilon})^\tau.$$

It is proved in Subsection 5.6, with a remark on the extension to families.

Now fix the value of τ and b and abbreviate $c_3(b, \tau) = c_3$.

5.4.2. *Quadratic estimate.* Let $\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon : W\times\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon|_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}$ be the linearization of $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_\epsilon$ at $(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon)$. To apply the implicit function theorem, we also need to bound the variation of $\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon$.

Consider a small different perturbation parameter $\mathbf{p}'$, a small deformation parameter $\mathbf{a}'$, and a deformation of the gauged map $\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon = (\xi'_\epsilon, \alpha'_\epsilon) \in \hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon$. Denote $\mathbf{w}' = (\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{a}')$ and $\mathbf{w}'' = \mathbf{w}_\circ + \mathbf{w}'$. Then define

$$\mathbf{v}''_\epsilon = (u''_\epsilon, a''_\epsilon) := (\exp_{u_\epsilon} \xi'_\epsilon, a_\epsilon + \alpha'_\epsilon).$$

The linearization of $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_\epsilon$ at $(\mathbf{w}'', \mathbf{v}''_\epsilon)$ is a linear operator

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}''_\epsilon : W \times T_{\mathbf{v}''_\epsilon}\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon|_{\mathbf{v}''_\epsilon}.$$

The quadratic estimate asks to control the variation $\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}''_\epsilon - \widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon$. To compare, one identifies E_{u_ϵ} with $E_{u''_\epsilon}$ using the parallel transport of the connection ∇ along shortest geodesics

$$\mathit{p\ell}_\epsilon : E_{u_\epsilon} \to E_{u''_\epsilon}$$

By abuse of notation, it induces the identifications

$$\mathit{p\ell}_\epsilon : T_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon \to T_{\mathbf{v}''_\epsilon}\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon,\ \mathit{p\ell}_\epsilon : \hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon|_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon} \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon|_{\mathbf{v}''_\epsilon}.$$

Then we would like to estimate the difference

$$\mathit{p\ell}_\epsilon^{-1} \circ \widetilde{\mathscr{D}}''_\epsilon \circ \mathit{p\ell}_\epsilon - \widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon : W \times T_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon|_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}.$$

For convenience, for $\boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon = (\xi_\epsilon, \alpha_\epsilon) \in T_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon$, denote $\boldsymbol{\xi}''_\epsilon := (\xi''_\epsilon, \alpha_\epsilon) = (\mathit{p\ell}_\epsilon(\xi), \alpha_\epsilon) \in T_{\mathbf{v}''_\epsilon}\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon$. We will also omit $\mathit{p\ell}_\epsilon$ whenever no confusion is caused.

First of all, by the smoothness of the perturbation term and the uniform Sobolev estimate (Lemma 5.4), we have

Lemma 5.6. *There exist $\epsilon_4 > 0$ and $c_4 > 0$ such that, for all $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_4)$, $\mathbf{w}' \in W^{\epsilon_4}$ and all $\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon \in \hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon} \leqslant \epsilon_4$, denoting $\mathbf{v}''_\epsilon = \exp_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon$ and $\mathbf{w}'' = \mathbf{w}_\circ + \mathbf{w}'$, one has*

$$\|\mathit{p\ell}_\epsilon^{-1} d\iota^\epsilon_{\mathbf{w}'', \mathbf{v}''_\epsilon}(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\xi}'') - d\iota^\epsilon_{\mathbf{w}_0, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon}(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\xi})\| \leqslant c_4(\|\mathbf{w}'\| + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}'\|_{1;\epsilon})(\|\mathbf{w}\| + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon}).$$

Therefore, to prove the quadratic estimate it remains to bound the variation of $d\hat{\mathscr{F}}$.

Proposition 5.7. *There exist $\epsilon_5 > 0$ and $c_5 > 0$ such that for all $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_5)$ and all $\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon \in T_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon} \leqslant \epsilon_5$, using the notations above,*

$$\|\hat{\mathscr{D}}''_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{\xi}'') - \hat{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{\xi})\|_{0;\epsilon} \leqslant c_5\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon}. \tag{5.8}$$

This proposition is proved in Subsection 5.7. There is no need to consider the extension to families of approximate solutions.

Lemma 5.6 and Proposition 5.7 together imply the following estimate.

Corollary 5.8. *There exist ϵ_6 and c_6 such that, for all $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_6)$ and all $(\mathbf{w}', \boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon) \in W^{\epsilon_0} \times T_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon} \leqslant \epsilon_6$, denoting $\mathbf{v}''_\epsilon = \exp_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon$ and $\mathbf{w}'' = \mathbf{w}_\circ + \mathbf{w}'$, one has*

$$\|\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}''_\epsilon(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) - \widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon(\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\xi})\|_{0;\epsilon} \leqslant c_6(\|\mathbf{w}'\| + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon})(\|\mathbf{w}\| + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon}).$$

5.4.3. *The right inverse.* We use the family of right inverses $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_{\Delta,\epsilon}$ constructed in Section 4 to construct the right inverses along $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon$.

Proposition 5.9. *There exist ϵ_7, c_7, and, for each $\epsilon \in (0,\epsilon_7)$, a bounded right inverse $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\epsilon : \hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon|_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon} \to W \times T_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon$ to the operator $\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon$ such that $\|\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\epsilon\| \leqslant c_7$.*

The construction of $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\epsilon$ and the proof of this proposition are given in Subsection 5.7. Again there is no need to consider the extension to families of approximate solutions.

5.4.4. *The gluing map.* Now we are ready to apply the implicit function theorem. Let us first cite a precise version of it.

Proposition 5.10. [8, Proposition A.3.4] *Let X, Y be Banach spaces, $U \subset X$ be an open set and $f : U \to Y$ be a continuously differentiable map. Let $x_\circ \in U$ be such that $df(x_\circ) : X \to Y$ is surjective and has a bounded right inverse $Q : Y \to X$.*

Assume there are constants $\delta, c > 0$ such that

$$\|Q\| \leqslant c; \tag{5.9}$$

$$B_\delta(x_\circ) \subset U \text{ and } x \in B_\delta(x_0) \Longrightarrow \|df(x) - df(x_\circ)\| \leqslant \frac{1}{2c}. \tag{5.10}$$

Suppose $x' \in X$ satisfies

$$\|f(x')\| < \frac{\delta}{4c},\ \|x' - x_\circ\| < \frac{\delta}{8}, \tag{5.11}$$

then there exists a unique $x \in X$ satisfying

$$f(x) = 0,\ x - x' \in \mathrm{Im}Q,\ \|x - x_\circ\| \leqslant \delta. \tag{5.12}$$

Moreover,

$$\|x - x'\| \leqslant 2c\|f(x')\|. \tag{5.13}$$

Now let $X = W \times T_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon$, $Y = \hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon|_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}$, $f = \mathfrak{p}\ell_\epsilon^{-1} \circ \widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_\epsilon \circ \mathfrak{p}\ell_\epsilon$, $x_\circ = (\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon)$. Then (5.9) holds for $c = c_7$. Corollary 5.8 implies (5.10) holds for

$$\delta = \frac{1}{2c_6c_7}.$$

Let $x_1 = x_\circ = (\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon)$. Then Proposition 5.5 implies that, when $\epsilon < (8c_3c_6c_7^2)^{-2/\tau}$, (5.11) is satisfied. Therefore by Proposition 5.10 there exists a unique x satisfying (5.12), which we denote by

$$(\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_\epsilon, \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_\epsilon) = (\mathbf{w}_\circ + \widetilde{\mathbf{w}}'_\epsilon, \exp_{\mathbf{v}_\epsilon}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}'_\epsilon) \in W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon.$$

Then we denote the gluing map by

$$\mathscr{G}\ell\widetilde{\mathscr{u}\mathscr{e}}(\epsilon) = [\widetilde{\mathbf{w}}_\epsilon, \widetilde{\mathbf{v}}_\epsilon],\ \forall \epsilon \in (0,\epsilon_7),\ \mathscr{G}\ell\widetilde{\mathscr{u}\mathscr{e}}(0) = [\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\circ].$$

This is obviously a continuous map from $[0,\epsilon_7)$ to $\overline{\mathscr{M}}_{l,\underline{l}}(\mathbb{H}; X, L)$. It remains to show that it is a local homeomorphism, hence a local chart of topological manifold with boundary.

5.5. **Proof of injectivity and surjectivity.** As before, we only prove for the case of index zero. The transversality implies that the point $[\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{x}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\circ]$ is an isolated point of $\mathscr{M}_\Delta(\mathbb{H}; X, L)$ and the gluing map $\mathscr{G}\ell\widetilde{u}\widetilde{e}$ only depends on the gluing parameter ϵ. Suppose there are ϵ^a and ϵ^b such that $\epsilon^a, \epsilon^b \in (0, \epsilon_7]$ and

$$\mathscr{G}\ell\widetilde{u}\widetilde{e}(\epsilon^a) = \mathscr{G}\ell\widetilde{u}\widetilde{e}(\epsilon^b) \in \overline{\mathscr{M}}_{l,\underline{l}}(\mathbb{H}; X, L).$$

The underlying marked curves of the corresponding exact solutions we constructed are equivalent. By Lemma 3.2, their underlying marked curves are actually identical. Therefore, $\epsilon^a = \epsilon^b$. This proves the injectivity.

Now we prove the surjectivity. The main difficulty is that the topology of $\overline{\mathscr{M}}_{l,\underline{l}}(\mathbb{H}; X, L)$ is defined in terms of a very weak notion of convergence. In particular, for a sequence of perturbed vortices $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$, for each $R > 0$, we only require that a C^0_{loc} convergence for the rescaled one $(s_\epsilon^{-1})^*\big(\mathbf{v}^{(i)}|_{C_{R\epsilon^{-1}}}\big)$. However, we need to show that every nearby smooth vortex $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ is actually close to the approximate solution $\mathbf{v}_{\epsilon_i}$ with respect to our norm in $\hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\epsilon_i}$. This is similar to the case of Gaio-Salamon [6], where the surjectivity, based on their *a priori* estimates in Section 9 and 10, was the most difficult part. More precisely, the surjectivity follows almost immediately from the following theorem.

Theorem 5.11. *Suppose a sequence $[\mathbf{w}^{(i)}, \mathbf{v}^{(i)}] \in \mathscr{M}_{l,\underline{l}}(\mathbb{H}; X, L)$ converges to $[\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\circ]$, namely, up to gauge transformation, $(\mathbf{w}^{(i)}, \mathbf{v}^{(i)})$ and $(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\circ)$ satisfy the conditions of Definition 3.7. Then for i sufficiently large, we can gauge transform $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ to a sequence of smooth vortices (which we still denote by $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$) such that $\mathbf{v}^{(i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{v}'_\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(i)}$ where $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(i)} \in \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\mathbf{v}'_\epsilon}$ and*

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(i)}\|_{1,\epsilon} = 0.$$

This theorem is proved in Subsection 5.9. Therefore, we finished proving the surjectivity and the construction of the gluing map is complete.

5.6. **Estimate the failure.**

Proof of Proposition 5.5. We denote the three components of $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_\epsilon$ by $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_1$, $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_2$ and $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_3$ respectively, where only $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_1$ depends on the perturbation term. Then $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_3(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon) = 0$ automatically. Now we estimate $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_1(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon)$

(a) Inside each $B^i_{\epsilon;-2}$, one has

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_1(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon) = \overline{\partial}_{A_i} u_i + \iota_\epsilon(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_i) = \iota_\epsilon(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_i) - \iota_0(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_i).$$

Here we used the equation $\overline{\partial}_{A_i} u_i + \iota_0(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_i) = 0$. Then by the definition of the norm the definition of the perturbation ι_ϵ (which is supported on a compact subset and depends on ϵ smoothly), one has

$$\big\|\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_1(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\big\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B^i_{\epsilon;-2})} \lesssim \epsilon. \tag{5.14}$$

(b) Over $\Sigma_{\epsilon;2}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_1(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon) &= \overline{\partial}_{A_{\infty,\epsilon}} u_{\infty,\epsilon} + \iota_{\infty,\epsilon}(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_{\infty,\epsilon}) \\ &= \iota_{\infty,\epsilon}(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_{\infty,\epsilon}) - \iota_{\infty,0}(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_{\infty,\epsilon}) \\ &= \epsilon s_\epsilon^*(\iota_\epsilon(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_\infty) - \iota_0(\mathbf{w}_\circ, u_\infty)).\end{aligned}$$

Then by the property of ι_ϵ, and Lemma 4.7, one has

$$\|\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_1(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{\mathrm{mix};\epsilon}(\Sigma_{\epsilon;2})} \lesssim \epsilon. \tag{5.15}$$

(c) In the interior part of the neck region $A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2} := B^i_{\epsilon;0} \smallsetminus B^i_{\epsilon;-2}$, we have

$$u_\epsilon(z) = e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i}\beta_{i,\epsilon}\check{u}_i(z),\ a_\epsilon = e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i}\cdot(\beta_{i,\epsilon}\check{\alpha}_i).$$

Here we regard $\check{u}_i$ as $\mathbb{R}^{2n}$-valued, as when we construct u_ϵ. Moreover, the perturbation term vanishes in the neck region. So

$$\begin{aligned}e^{\lambda_i\theta_i}\Big(\overline{\partial}_{A_\epsilon}u_\epsilon\Big) &= \frac{\partial\check{u}_\epsilon}{\partial s} + J_X(\check{u}_\epsilon)\frac{\partial\check{u}_\epsilon}{\partial t} + \beta_{i,\epsilon}(\mathfrak{X}_{\check{\phi}_i} + J_X(\check{u}_\epsilon)\mathfrak{X}_{\check{\psi}_i}) \\ &= \beta_{i,\epsilon}\Big[\frac{\partial\check{u}_i}{\partial s} + \mathfrak{X}_{\check{\phi}_i}(\check{u}_\epsilon) + J_X(\check{u}_\epsilon)\Big(\frac{\partial\check{u}_i}{\partial t} + \mathfrak{X}_{\check{\psi}_i}(\check{u}_\epsilon)\Big)\Big] + \frac{\partial\beta_{i,\epsilon}}{\partial s}\check{u}_i + J_X(\check{u}_\epsilon)\frac{\partial\beta_{i,\epsilon}}{\partial t}\check{u}_i \\ = \beta_{i,\epsilon}\Big[\mathfrak{X}_{\check{\phi}_i}(\check{u}_\epsilon) - \mathfrak{X}_{\check{\phi}_i}(\check{u}_i) + J_X(\check{u}_\epsilon)\mathfrak{X}_{\check{\psi}_i}(\check{u}_\epsilon) - J_X(\check{u}_i)\mathfrak{X}_{\check{\psi}_i}(\check{u}_i)\Big] &+ \frac{\partial\beta_{i,\epsilon}}{\partial s}\check{u}_i + J_X(\check{u}_\epsilon)\frac{\partial\beta_{i,\epsilon}}{\partial t}\check{u}_i.\end{aligned}$$

In the last line, let F_1 be the sum of the terms involving the derivatives of $\beta_{i,\epsilon}$, and F_2 be the sum of other terms. To estimate them, firstly recall that, by the main result of [27] and [15, Proposition A.4], the energy density of $\mathbf{v}_i$ decays in the following way:

$$|\mathrm{d}_{A_i}u_i(z_i)|^2 + |F_{A_i}(z_i)|^2 + |\mu(u_i(z_i))|^2 \lesssim_\alpha |z_i|^{-4+\alpha}. \tag{5.16}$$

Therefore, for $z = z_{i,\epsilon} + z_i \in A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2}$

$$\mathrm{dist}(\check{u}_i(z_i), x_i) \lesssim_\alpha (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{1-\alpha} \Longrightarrow \sup_{A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2}}|u_i - u_\epsilon| \lesssim_\alpha (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{1-\alpha}. \tag{5.17}$$

Moreover,

$$\sup_{z\in A^i_{\epsilon;2}}\rho^H_\epsilon(z),\ \sup_{z\in A^i_{\epsilon;2}}\rho^G_\epsilon(z) \lesssim \frac{1}{\epsilon};\ \sup_{z\in A^i_{\epsilon,2}}\sigma^G_\epsilon(z),\ \sup_{z\in A^i_{\epsilon;2}}\sigma^H_\epsilon(z) \lesssim 1. \tag{5.18}$$

So using the fact that $|\nabla\beta_{i,\epsilon}| \lesssim \sqrt{\epsilon}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\|(\partial_s\beta_{i,\epsilon})\check{u}_i + J_X(\check{u}_\epsilon)(\partial_t\beta_{i,\epsilon})\check{u}_i\|_{0;\epsilon} \\ &\lesssim \left[\int_{A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2}}\big|\nabla\beta_{i,\epsilon}(z)\big|^p\Big[\sup_{z\in A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2}}\mathrm{dist}(\check{u}_i, x_i)\Big]^p\Big(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\Big)^{\frac{p\delta}{2}}dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim_\alpha (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{2-\alpha-\delta}\Big[\mathrm{Area}(A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2})\Big]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim_\alpha (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{2-\alpha-\delta-\frac{2}{p}} = (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{\frac{2}{p}-\alpha}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

On the other hand, by Sobolev embedding, one has

$$\|\check{\alpha}_i\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_G} \leqslant c_i \Longrightarrow \sup_{A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2}} \left(|\check{\phi}_i| + |\check{\psi}_i|\right) \lesssim (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{\delta}. \tag{5.20}$$

Then by (5.17), (5.18), (5.20) one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\beta_{i,\epsilon}\Big[\mathfrak{X}_{\check{\phi}_i}(u_\epsilon) - \mathfrak{X}_{\check{\phi}_i}(u_i) + J_X(u_\epsilon)\mathfrak{X}_{\check{\psi}_i}(u_\epsilon) - J_X(u_i)\mathfrak{X}_{\check{\psi}_i}(u_i)\Big]\right\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2})} \\
&\lesssim \left[\int_{A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2}} \Big[\sup_{A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2}} |\check{\alpha}_i|\Big]^p \Big[\sup_{A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2}} \mathrm{dist}(u_\epsilon, u_i)\Big]^p \Big(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\Big)^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} dzd\bar{z}\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\lesssim_\alpha (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{1-\alpha}\Big[\mathrm{Area}(A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2})\Big]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\
&\lesssim_\alpha (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{1-\alpha-\frac{2}{p}}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

Therefore, by (5.19) and (5.21), one has

$$\|\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_1(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2})} \leqslant c_{a,\alpha}(\sqrt{\epsilon})^{1-\alpha-\frac{2}{p}}.$$

(d) In the outer part of the neck region $A^{i,+}_{\epsilon;2} := B^i_{\epsilon;2} \smallsetminus B^i_{\epsilon;0}$ we can derive similar estimate. We remark that we have even better bound than (5.17) and (5.20) if replace $\check{u}_i$ by $\check{u}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ and $\check{\alpha}_i$ by $\check{\alpha}_{\infty,\epsilon}$, i.e.,

$$\sup_{A^{i,+}_{\epsilon;2}} \mathrm{dist}(u_{\infty,\epsilon} - u_\epsilon) \lesssim \sqrt{\epsilon}; \quad \sup_{A^{i,+}_{\epsilon;2}} |\check{\alpha}_{\infty,\epsilon}| \lesssim \epsilon. \tag{5.22}$$

So at least one has

$$\|\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_1(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(A^{i,+}_{\epsilon;2})} \lesssim (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{1-\alpha-\frac{2}{p}}.$$

In summary, if $\tau < 1 - \frac{2}{p}$, then by taking α appropriately, one can find $c_{a,\tau} > 0$ such that for ϵ small enough,

$$\|\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_1(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon)\|_{0;\epsilon} \leqslant c_{a,\tau}(\sqrt{\epsilon})^{\tau}. \tag{5.23}$$

Now we estimate $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_2(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon) = *F_{A_\epsilon} + \mu(u_\epsilon)$. Over $\Sigma_{\epsilon;0}$,

$$*F_{A_\epsilon} + \mu(u_\epsilon) = *d(\beta_{\infty,\epsilon}\check{\alpha}_{\infty,\epsilon}) + \mu(u_\epsilon) = \beta_{\infty,\epsilon} * F_{A_{\infty,\epsilon}} + *(d\beta_{\infty,\epsilon} \wedge \check{\alpha}_{\infty,\epsilon}) + \mu(u_\epsilon).$$

Over $B^i_{\epsilon;0}$,

$$*F_{A_\epsilon} + \mu(u_\epsilon) = *d(\beta_{i,\epsilon}\check{\alpha}_{i,\epsilon}) + \mu(u_\epsilon) = \beta_{i,\epsilon}[\mu(u_\epsilon) - \mu(u_i)] + (1-\beta_{i,\epsilon})\mu(u_\epsilon) + *(d\beta_{i,\epsilon} \wedge \check{\alpha}_{i,\epsilon}).$$

So as a unifying expression,

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_2(\mathbf{w}_\circ, \mathbf{v}_\epsilon) = \beta_{\infty,\epsilon}*F_{A_{\infty,\epsilon}} + *(d\beta_{\infty,\epsilon}\wedge\check{\alpha}_{\infty,\epsilon}) + *(d\beta_{i,\epsilon}\wedge\check{\alpha}_i) + (1-\beta_{i,\epsilon})\mu(u_\epsilon) + \beta_{i,\epsilon}[\mu(u_\epsilon) - \mu(u_i)].$$

We estimate the terms one by one.

(a) One has $F_{A_{\infty,\epsilon}} = s^*_\epsilon F_{A_\infty}$, so by Lemma 4.7,

$$\|\beta_{\infty,\epsilon} * F_{A_{\infty,\epsilon}}\|_{0;\epsilon} \leqslant \|s^*_\epsilon F_{A_\infty}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}} = \epsilon\|F_{A_\infty}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_G} \lesssim \epsilon. \tag{5.24}$$

(b) By (5.18) and (5.22), and the fact that $|\nabla\beta_{\infty,\epsilon}| \lesssim \sqrt{\epsilon}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\| * (\mathrm{d}\beta_{\infty,\epsilon} \wedge \check{\alpha}_{\infty,\epsilon})\|_{0;\epsilon} &\leqslant \|\nabla\beta_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty}\left[\int_{A^{i,+}_{\epsilon;2}} |\check{\alpha}_{\infty,\epsilon}(z)|^p (\rho^G_{\infty,\epsilon}(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}}\Big[\mathrm{Area}(A^{i,+}_{\epsilon;2})\Big]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{3-\delta-\frac{2}{p}} = (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{1+\frac{2}{p}}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

(c) By (5.18), (5.20) and $|\nabla\beta_{i,\epsilon}| \lesssim \sqrt{\epsilon}$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\| * (\mathrm{d}\beta_{i,\epsilon} \wedge \check{\alpha}_i)\|_{0;\epsilon} &\leqslant \|\nabla\beta_{i,\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty}\left[\int_{A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2}} |\check{\alpha}_i(z)|^p (\rho^G_{\epsilon}(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\epsilon}\Big[\mathrm{Area}(A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2})\Big]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{1-\frac{2}{p}}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

(d) By (5.16) we know that in the neck region $|\mu(u_\epsilon)| \lesssim_\alpha (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{2-\alpha}$, so

$$\begin{aligned}\|(1-\beta_{i,\epsilon})\mu(u_\epsilon)\|_{0;\epsilon} \leqslant & \left[\int_{A^i_{\epsilon,2}} \Big(\sup_{A^i_{\epsilon;2}} |\mu(u_\epsilon)|\Big)^p (\rho^G_\epsilon(z))^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ \lesssim_\alpha & (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{2-\alpha-\delta}\Big[\mathrm{Area}(A^i_{\epsilon,a})\Big]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ \lesssim & (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{2-\delta-\frac{2}{p}-\alpha} = (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{\frac{2}{p}-\alpha}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

(e) By the energy decay we also have $|\mu(u_\epsilon) - \mu(u_i)| \lesssim (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{2-\alpha}$. So

$$\|\beta_{i,\epsilon}(\mu(u_\epsilon) - \mu(u_i))\|_{0;\epsilon} \lesssim (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{2-\alpha}\Big[\mathrm{Area}(A^{i,-}_{\epsilon;2})\Big]^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim_\alpha (\sqrt{\epsilon})^{2-\frac{2}{p}-\alpha}. \tag{5.28}$$

By (5.24)–(5.28), for $\tau < \min\left\{1-\frac{2}{p}, \frac{2}{p}\right\} = 1-\frac{2}{p}$, by taking α appropriately, one has

$$\| * F_{A_\epsilon} + \mu(u_\epsilon)\|_\epsilon \lesssim (\sqrt{\epsilon})^\tau.$$

Together with (5.23), we proved Proposition 5.5. □

Remark 5.12. The extension of the failure estimate uniformly to a family of approximate solutions is almost immediate. It basically relies on the uniform decay estimate of affine vortices, which were established in [15]. The $\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_3$ term, though, will not vanish automatically and needs extra (still simple) treatment.

5.7. **Quadratic estimate.**

Proof of Proposition 5.7. Consider an intermediate object $\mathbf{v}'''_\epsilon = (u_\epsilon, a'_\epsilon)$ with linearized operator $\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}'''_\epsilon = d\widetilde{\mathscr{F}}_{\mathbf{v}'''_\epsilon} : \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\mathbf{v}'''_\epsilon} \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\mathbf{v}'''_\epsilon}$. We separate the comparison into two steps.

Step 1. We first compare $\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon'''$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon$, whose domains and targets are identified without using parallel transport. Identify $\alpha = \eta ds + \zeta dt$ with (η, ζ). Then

$$(\hat{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon''' - \hat{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon)(\xi, \eta, \zeta) = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_\xi \mathfrak{X}_{\eta_\epsilon'}(u_\epsilon) + \nabla_\xi (J\mathfrak{X}_{\zeta_\epsilon'})(u_\epsilon) \\ [\eta_\epsilon', \eta] + [\zeta_\epsilon', \zeta] \\ [\eta_\epsilon', \zeta] - [\zeta_\epsilon', \eta] \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 5.4, Lemma 5.3 and the definition of the norm (5.7), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\hat{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon''' - \hat{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon)(\xi, \eta, \zeta)\|_{0;\epsilon} &\lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{L^\infty} \left[\int_{\mathbb{H}} |\alpha_\epsilon'(z)|^p [\rho_\epsilon^G(z)]^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} ds dt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \\ &\lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon} \|\alpha_\epsilon'\|_{1;\epsilon} \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon'\|_{1;\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

Step 2. Now we compare $\hat{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon'''$ with $\hat{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon''$. Firstly, for $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (0, \alpha) = (0, \eta, \zeta)$, we have

$$(\hat{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon'' - \hat{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon''')(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{p}\ell_\epsilon^{-1}\Big[\mathfrak{X}_\eta(u_\epsilon') + J(u_\epsilon')\mathfrak{X}_\zeta(u_\epsilon')\Big] - \mathfrak{X}_\eta(u_\epsilon) - J(u_\epsilon)\mathfrak{X}_\zeta(u_\epsilon) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hence similar to (5.29),

$$\|(\hat{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon'' - \hat{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon''')(\boldsymbol{\xi})\|_{0;\epsilon} \lesssim \|\alpha\|_{1;\epsilon} \|\xi_\epsilon'\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon'\|_{1;\epsilon}. \tag{5.30}$$

Lastly, consider $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi, 0, 0)$ and denote $\xi'' = \mathfrak{p}\ell_\epsilon(\xi)$. Then

$$(\hat{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon'' - \hat{\mathfrak{D}}_\epsilon''')(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathfrak{p}\ell_\epsilon^{-1}\Big[I(u_\epsilon', \phi_\epsilon', \psi_\epsilon')(\xi'')\Big] - I(u_\epsilon, \phi_\epsilon', \psi_\epsilon')(\xi) \\ d\mu(u_\epsilon') \cdot \xi'' - d\mu(u_\epsilon) \cdot \xi \\ d\mu(u_\epsilon') \cdot J\xi'' - d\mu(u_\epsilon) \cdot J\xi \end{bmatrix}. \tag{5.31}$$

Here the term I in the first entry is defined by

$$I(u, \phi, \psi)(\xi) = \nabla_s \xi + \nabla_\xi \mathfrak{X}_\phi + J(\nabla_t \xi + \nabla_\xi \mathfrak{X}_\psi) + (\nabla_\xi J)(\partial_t u + \mathfrak{X}_\psi(u)).$$

Now we estimate (5.31). The last two entries are easy to bound. Indeed, by the Sobolev estimate (Lemma 5.4) and the definition of the norm, also the fact that $\mathfrak{p}\ell_\epsilon$ preserves the splitting $H_X \oplus G_X$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\|d\mu(u_\epsilon') \cdot \xi'' - d\mu(u_\epsilon) \cdot \xi\|_{0;\epsilon} + \|d\mu(u_\epsilon') \cdot J\xi'' - d\mu(u_\epsilon) \cdot J\xi\|_{0;\epsilon} \\ &\qquad \lesssim \|\xi_\epsilon'\|_{L^\infty} \left[\int_{\mathbb{H}} |\xi^G(z)|^p [\rho_\epsilon^G(z)]^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} ds dt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon'\|_{1;\epsilon} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.32}$$

Now we estimate the first entry of (5.31). For convenience, introduce

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(u)(\xi) &= \nabla_s \xi + J\nabla_t \xi + (\nabla_\xi J)(\partial_t u), \\ I_2(u, \phi, \psi)(\xi) &= \nabla_\xi \mathfrak{X}_\phi + J\nabla_\xi \mathfrak{X}_\psi + (\nabla_\xi J)\mathfrak{X}_\psi, \end{aligned}$$

and write the first entry of (5.31) as $(\delta I_1)(\xi) + (\delta I_2)(\xi)$. Take $R > 0$ and define

$$U_1 := \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} B_R^i := \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} B_R(z_{i,\epsilon}),\ U_2 := \mathbb{H} \smallsetminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} B_{\frac{1}{\epsilon R}}(z_{i,\epsilon}),\ U_3 := \mathbb{H} \smallsetminus (U_1 \cup U_2).$$

In the following we estimate the variation of I_1 and I_2 in the above regions. We will use the fact that $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon} \leqslant 1$ and the uniform Sobolev embedding $L^{1,p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon} \hookrightarrow C^0$ (Lemma 5.4) frequently without explicitly mentioning them.

(a) Inside each B_R^i, the variation of I_1 can be bounded pointwise as

$$|(\delta I_1)(\xi)| \lesssim |du_\epsilon||\xi||\xi'_\epsilon| + |\nabla\xi||\xi||\xi'_\epsilon| + |\nabla\xi||\xi'_\epsilon| + |\nabla\xi'_\epsilon||\xi|. \tag{5.33}$$

(See [8, Proof of Proposition 3.5.3] for details.) One has

$$|\nabla\xi| \lesssim |du_\epsilon||\xi| + |\nabla^{A_\epsilon}\xi| + |\phi_\epsilon||\xi| + |\psi_\epsilon||\xi|, \tag{5.34}$$

$$|\nabla\xi'| \lesssim |du_\epsilon||\xi'| + |\nabla^{A_\epsilon}\xi'| + |\phi_\epsilon||\xi'| + |\psi_\epsilon||\xi'|. \tag{5.35}$$

Then since $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon|_{B_R^i} = \mathbf{v}_i$ which is independent of ϵ, one has

$$\|\nabla\xi\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B_R^i)} \lesssim \|\nabla^{A_\epsilon}\xi\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B_R^i)} + \Big[\|du_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B_R^i)} + \|a_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(B_R^i)}\Big]\|\xi\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon};$$
$$\|\nabla\xi'_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B_R^i)} \lesssim \|\nabla^{A_\epsilon}\xi'_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B_R^i)} + \Big[\|du_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B_R^i)} + \|a_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(B_R^i)}\Big]\|\xi'_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon}.$$

Hence by (5.33),

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\delta I_1)(\xi)\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B_R^i)} &\lesssim \Big[\|du_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B_R^i)} + \|\nabla\xi\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B_R^i)}\Big]\|\xi\|_{L^\infty}\|\xi'_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty} \\ &\quad + \|\xi'_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla\xi\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B_R^i)} + \|\nabla\xi'_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B_R^i)}\|\xi\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.36}$$

(b) Since I_2 is a tensor in ξ, ϕ'_ϵ and ψ'_ϵ, one has

$$|(\delta I_2)(\xi)| \lesssim |\xi||\xi'_\epsilon||a'_\epsilon| \leqslant |\xi||\xi'_\epsilon|\Big[|a_\epsilon| + |\alpha'_\epsilon|\Big].$$

Therefore

$$\|(\delta I_2)(\xi)\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B_R^i)} \lesssim \|\xi\|_{L^\infty}\|\xi'_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty}\|a'_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(B_R^i)} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon}. \tag{5.37}$$

(c) Now we estimate the variation of I_1, I_2 over U_2. Using the same argument as in Step (a), one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla\xi\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U_2)} &\lesssim \Big[\|du_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U_2)} + \|a_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(U_2)}\Big]\|\xi\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla^{A_{\infty,\epsilon}}\xi\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U_2)} \\ &\leqslant \epsilon\Big[\|s_\epsilon^* du_\infty\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}} + \|s_\epsilon^*\phi_\infty\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}} + \|s_\epsilon^*\psi_\infty\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}}\Big]\|\xi\|_{L^\infty} + \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

Here to obtain the last inequality we used Lemma 4.7. Similarly

$$\|\nabla\xi'_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U_2)} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon}.$$

Hence (5.33) implies that

$$\|(\delta I_1)(\xi)\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U_2)} \lesssim \Big[\|du_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U_2)} + \|\nabla\xi\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U_2)}\Big]\|\xi\|_{L^\infty}\|\xi'_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty} + \|\xi'_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla\xi\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U_2)} + \|\nabla\xi'_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U_2)}\|\xi\|_{L^\infty} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon}.$$

Further, as in Step (b), one has

$$\|(\delta I_2)(\xi)\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U_2)} \lesssim \|a'_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(U_2)}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon}.$$

By the relation $(\phi_\epsilon,\psi_\epsilon)|_{U_2} = \epsilon(s_\epsilon^*\phi_\infty, s_\epsilon^*\psi_\infty)$ and Lemma 4.7, the factor in front of $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon}$ above is uniformly bounded. So

$$\|(\delta I_2)(\xi)\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U_2)} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon}.$$

(d) Lastly, we estimate over the neck region U_3, which has connected components U_3^i for $i = 1,\ldots,m+\underline{m}$. For each i, denote

$$\check\alpha'_\epsilon = \check\phi'_\epsilon ds + \check\psi'_\epsilon dt = e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i}\alpha'_\epsilon e^{\lambda_i\theta_i} - \lambda_i d\theta_i,$$

$$\check\xi = e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i}\xi,\ \check\xi'' = e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i}\xi'',\ \check\xi'_\epsilon = e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i}\xi'_\epsilon.$$

Recall that

$$\check\alpha_\epsilon = \check\phi_\epsilon ds + \check\psi_\epsilon dt = \beta_{i,\epsilon}\check\alpha_i + \beta_{\infty,\epsilon}\check\alpha_{\infty,\epsilon}.$$

Denote $U_2^{i,-} = U_2^i \cap B^i_{\epsilon;0}$, $U_2^{i,+} = U_2^i \cap \Sigma_{\epsilon;0}$. So

$$\|\check\alpha_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(U_2^i)} \leqslant \|\check\alpha_i\|_{L^{p,\delta}_G(U_2^{i,-})} + \|\check\alpha_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}(U_2^{i,+})} \leqslant c$$

for some constant $c>0$ independent of ϵ. One can also obtain a uniform bound on $\|d\check u_\epsilon\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(U_3^i)}$.

Using the above notation, $e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i}(\delta I)(\xi)$ is the sum of the following two parts.

$$(\delta\check I_1)(\check\xi) = \mathfrak{pl}_\epsilon\Big[\nabla_s\check\xi'' + J\nabla_t\check\xi'' + (\nabla_{\check\xi''}J)(\partial_t\check u_\epsilon)\Big] - \Big[\nabla_s\check\xi + J\nabla_t\check\xi + (\nabla_{\check\xi}J)\partial_t\check u_\epsilon\Big];$$

$$(\delta\check I_2)(\check\xi) = \mathfrak{pl}_\epsilon\Big[\nabla_{\check\xi''}\mathfrak{X}_{\check\phi'_\epsilon} + \nabla_{\check\xi''}(J\mathfrak{X}_{\check\psi'_\epsilon})\Big] - \Big[\nabla_{\check\xi}\mathfrak{X}_{\check\phi'_\epsilon} + \nabla_{\check\xi}(J\mathfrak{X}_{\check\psi'_\epsilon})\Big].$$

One can reproduce similar estimates as in previous steps using the uniform bounds on $\check\phi_\epsilon$, $\check\psi_\epsilon$ and $d\check u_\epsilon$. The detail is left to the reader.

The above steps (a)–(d) provides the bound

$$\|(\delta I)(\xi)\|_{0;\epsilon} \lesssim \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{1;\epsilon}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_\epsilon\|_{1;\epsilon}.$$

This completes the proof of this proposition. □

5.8. **Construction of the right inverse.** Now we construct the approximate right inverse along the gauged map $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon = (u_\epsilon, a_\epsilon)$. We reset the values of the constants $c_1 \leqslant c_2 \leqslant \cdots$ and $\epsilon_1 \geqslant \epsilon_2 \geqslant \cdots$. By our construction, u_ϵ is close to $u_{\infty,\epsilon}$ over $\Sigma_{\epsilon;0}$ and there is a parallel transport using the connection ∇

$$\mathfrak{pl}_\infty : u_{\infty,\epsilon}^* TX|_{\Sigma_{\epsilon;0}} \to u_\epsilon^* TX|_{\Sigma_{\epsilon;0}}.$$

There are also parallel transports

$$\mathfrak{pl}_i : u_i^* TX|_{B^i_{\epsilon;0}} \to u_\epsilon^* TX|_{B^i_{\epsilon;0}},\ i = 1, \ldots, m + \underline{m}.$$

We take $e < b$ and introduce cut-off functions $\chi^\epsilon_\infty, \chi^\epsilon_i : \mathbb{H} \to [0,1]$ satisfying the following conditions.

$$\mathrm{supp}\chi^\epsilon_\infty \subset \mathbb{H} \smallsetminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{\underline{s}+s} B\Big(z_{i,\epsilon}, \frac{1}{e\sqrt{\epsilon}}\Big),\ \chi^\epsilon_\infty|_{\Sigma_{\epsilon;1}} \equiv 1, \tag{5.38}$$

and for $z \in B\left(z_{i,\epsilon}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right) \smallsetminus B\left(z_{i,\epsilon}, \frac{1}{e\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right)$,

$$|\nabla \chi^\epsilon_\infty(z)| \leqslant \frac{2}{\log e} \frac{1}{|z - z_{i,\epsilon}|}. \tag{5.39}$$

Similarly we require

$$\mathrm{supp}\chi^\epsilon_i \subset B\Big(z_{i,\epsilon}, \frac{e}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\Big),\ \chi^\epsilon_i|_{B^i_{\epsilon;0}} \equiv 1$$

and for all $z \in B\left(z_{i,\epsilon}, \frac{e}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right) \smallsetminus B\left(z_{i,\epsilon}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right)$,

$$|\nabla \chi^\epsilon_i(z)| \leqslant \frac{2}{\log e} \frac{1}{|z - z_{i,\epsilon}|}. \tag{5.40}$$

Notice that when $\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty \neq 0$ or $\nabla\chi^\epsilon_i \neq 0$, $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon = \mathbf{c}_i = (e^{\lambda_i\theta_i} x_i, \lambda_i d\theta_i)$.

Using $\mathfrak{pl}_\infty$, $\mathfrak{pl}_i$ and χ^ϵ_∞, χ^ϵ_i, we define the maps

$$\mathfrak{cut} : \hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon \to \hat{\mathscr{E}}_{\infty,\epsilon} \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \hat{\mathscr{E}}_i, \qquad\qquad \mathfrak{pst} : \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\Delta,\epsilon} \to \hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon.$$

as follows. For $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon$, define $\mathfrak{cut}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = \big(\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\infty,\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\nu}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\nu}_{m+\underline{m}}\big)$ where

$$\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\infty,\epsilon}(z) = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{pl}_\infty^{-1}[\boldsymbol{\nu}(z)], & z \in \Sigma_{\epsilon;0}; \\ 0, & z \notin \Sigma_{\epsilon;0}. \end{cases};\ \boldsymbol{\nu}_i(z) = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{pl}_i^{-1}[\boldsymbol{\nu}(z + z_{i,\epsilon})], & z \in B^i_{\epsilon;0}; \\ 0, & z \notin B^i_{\epsilon;0}. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, take

$$\vec{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = (\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{m+\underline{m}}) \in \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\Delta,\epsilon} \subset \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\infty,\epsilon} \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \hat{\mathscr{B}}_i.$$

Then $u_i(\mathbb{A}_i \smallsetminus B^i_{\epsilon;-2}) \subset U_X$ and we can decompose $\xi_i = \xi_i^H + \xi_i^G$ with respect to the splitting $H_X \oplus G_X$. Then by the matching condition, there exist $\xi^{H,i} \in H_{X,x_i}$ for $i = , 1 \ldots, m$ and $\underline{\xi}^{H,j} \in H_{L,x_j}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, \underline{m}$, such that

$$\lim_{z \to z_{i,\epsilon}} e^{\lambda_i\theta_i} \xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z) = \lim_{z\to\infty} e^{\lambda_i\theta_i} \xi_i^H(z) = \xi^{H,i},\ i = 1, \ldots, m + \underline{m}.$$

Then define

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_\epsilon(z) := \mathit{pst}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{m+\underline{m}})(z) = \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\xi}_i(z - z_{i,\epsilon}), & z \in B^i_{\epsilon;-2}; \\ [\xi^H_\epsilon(z), \boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\epsilon(z)], & z \in \Sigma_{\epsilon;-2}. \end{cases} \tag{5.41}$$

where

$$\xi^H_\epsilon(z) = \begin{cases} \xi^H_i(z - z_{i,\epsilon}) + \chi^\epsilon_\infty \Big[\mathit{pl}_\infty[\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z)] - e^{-\lambda_i \theta_i} \xi^{H,i} \Big], & \substack{z \in B^i_{\epsilon;0} \setminus B^i_{\epsilon;-2}, \\ i = 1, \dots, m+\underline{m};} \\ \xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z) + \sum_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \chi^\epsilon_i \Big[\mathit{pl}_i[\xi^H_i(z - z_{i,\epsilon})] - e^{-\lambda_i \theta_i} \xi^{H,i} \Big], & z \in \Sigma_{\epsilon;0}. \end{cases} \tag{5.42}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_\epsilon(z) = \sum_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \chi^\epsilon_i \mathit{pl}_i[\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_i] + \chi^\epsilon_\infty \mathit{pl}_\infty[\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_{\infty,\epsilon}]. \tag{5.43}$$

With abuse of notation, use $\mathit{pst} : W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_{\Delta,\epsilon} \to W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon$ to denote the induced map which is the identity on the factor W.

Finally, define the "approximate right inverse"

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{app}}_\epsilon = \mathit{pst} \circ \widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_{\Delta,\epsilon} \circ \mathit{cut} : \hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon \to W \times \hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon. \tag{5.44}$$

Here $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_{\Delta,\epsilon}$ is the operator given by Proposition 4.14.

Proposition 5.13. *Suppose* $\log e \geqslant 8c_\Delta$. *Then there exist* ϵ_1 *and* c_1 *(which also depend on b) such that for* $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_1]$

$$\|\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{app}}_\epsilon\| \leqslant c_1, \ \ \|\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon \circ \widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{app}}_\epsilon - \mathrm{Id}\| \leqslant \frac{1}{2}. \tag{5.45}$$

Here the operator norms are taken with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{0;\epsilon}$ *on* $\hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon$ *and the norm* $\|\cdot\|_{1;\epsilon}$ *on* $\hat{\mathscr{B}}_\epsilon$.

Proposition 5.9 then follows from Proposition 5.13 by setting $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\epsilon = \widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{app}}_\epsilon \circ (\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon \circ \widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{app}}_\epsilon)^{-1}$. It remains to prove Proposition 5.13. By straightforward estimate and comparison between different norms, one has

Lemma 5.14. *There exist* $c_2 > 0$ *and* $\epsilon_2 \in (0, \epsilon_1]$ *such that for all* $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_2)$, *one has*

$$\|\mathit{cut}(\boldsymbol{\nu})\| = \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{0;\epsilon} + \sum_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_i\|_{L^{p,\delta}} \leqslant \|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_{0;\epsilon}, \tag{5.46}$$

$$\|\mathit{pst}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{m+\underline{m}})\|_{1;\epsilon} \leqslant c_2 \left[\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{1;\epsilon} + \sum_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_{1,p,\delta} \right]. \tag{5.47}$$

Proof. (5.46) is an easy consequence of the definition of the weight functions, the definition of cut, and the fact that the parallel transport is isometric fibrewise.

To prove the estimate about pst, one needs to pay extra attention to the cut-off functions χ^ϵ_∞ and χ^ϵ_i. It suffices to bound $\mathit{pst}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon})$ by $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{1;\epsilon}$ and to bound $\mathit{pst}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)$

by $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_{1,p,\delta}$. By the definition of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{1;\epsilon}$ (see (5.7)) and the definition of $\mathit{p\!s\!t}$ (see (5.41)–(5.43)), and the norm along $\mathbf{v}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ (see (4.11)),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\mathit{p\!s\!t}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon})\|_{1;\epsilon}\\
\leqslant\ &\sum_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}} |\xi^{H,i}| + \|\chi^\epsilon_\infty \xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\chi^\epsilon_\infty \xi^G_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\chi^\epsilon_\infty \boldsymbol{\xi}^G_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{G;\epsilon}} + \|\nabla^{A_\epsilon}(\chi^\epsilon_\infty \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon})\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}}\\
\lesssim\ &\|\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla^{A_\epsilon}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}} + \|(\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty)\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}} + \|(\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty)\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it suffices to bound the two norms that contain $\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty$. Notice that $|\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty|$ is uniformly bounded, and over the support of $\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty$, $\rho^G_\epsilon(z) \leqslant \rho^G_{\infty,\epsilon}(z)$. Therefore, by the definition of the norm,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty)\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{0;\epsilon} =\ &\left[\int_{\mathbb{H}} |\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty(z)|^p |\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_{\infty,\epsilon}(z)|^p [\rho^G_\epsilon(z)]^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
\leqslant\ &\|\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty\|_{L^\infty}\left[\int_{\mathrm{supp}\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty} |\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_{\infty,\epsilon}(z)|^p [\rho^G_{\infty,\epsilon}(z)]^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \qquad (5.48)\\
\leqslant\ &\|\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty\|_{L^\infty}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{1;\epsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the derivative of χ^ϵ_∞ is bounded in the cylindrical coordinates $\tau + \boldsymbol{i}\theta = \log(z - w_{i,\epsilon})$, i.e., there is $c > 0$ such that

$$|\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty| \leqslant \frac{c}{|z - z_{i,\epsilon}|} = ce^{-p\tau}.$$

Moreover, on $\mathrm{supp}\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty$, $e^\tau = |z - w_{i,\epsilon}| \leqslant (\epsilon|z - w_{i,\epsilon}|)^{-1} = e^{-\tau - \log\epsilon} = \sqrt{\rho^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z)}$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty)\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{0;\epsilon} =\ &\left[\int_{\mathbb{H}} |\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty(z)|^p |\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z)|^p [\rho^H_\epsilon(z)]^{\frac{p\delta}{2}} [\sigma^H_\epsilon(z)]^{1-\frac{p}{2}} dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
\leqslant\ &c\left[\int_{\mathrm{supp}\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty} |\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(\tau,\theta)|^p e^{(p\delta - p + 2)\tau} d\tau d\theta\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
\leqslant\ &c\left[\int_{\mathrm{supp}\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty} |\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(\tau,\theta)|^p e^{(p\delta - p + 2)(-\tau - \log\epsilon)} d\tau d\theta\right]^{\frac{1}{p}} \qquad (5.49)\\
=\ &c\left[\int_{\mathrm{supp}\nabla\chi^\epsilon_\infty} |\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z)|^p [\rho^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z)]^{\frac{p\delta - p}{2}} \rho^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z) dsdt\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}\\
\leqslant\ &c\|\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{1;\epsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\|\mathit{p\!s\!t}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon})\|_{1;\epsilon} \leqslant c'\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{1;\epsilon}$ for some c' depending on the cut-off function.

The estimate for $\mathit{p\!s\!t}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)$ follows similarly. □

Proof of Proposition 5.13. By Lemma 5.14 and the definition of $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{app}}_\epsilon$ (5.44), the bound on $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{app}}_\epsilon$ is equivalent to that of $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\Delta$, which is given by Proposition 4.14.

Now we prove the second inequality of (5.45). Given $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \hat{\mathscr{E}}_\epsilon$, denote

$$(\mathbf{w}, \overrightarrow{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) = (\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\underline{s}+s}) = \widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\Delta(\mathit{c\!u\!t}(\boldsymbol{\nu})).$$

Then by definition of $\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\Delta$ and cut, we have

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} = \mathit{pl}_\infty\Big[\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon}(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{v},\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon})\Big] + \sum_{i=1}^{s}\mathit{pl}_i\Big[\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_i(\mathbf{p},\mathbf{v},\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big].$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon\circ\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\epsilon^{\mathrm{app}}(\boldsymbol{\nu})-\boldsymbol{\nu}\\
&=\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon\Big[\mathbf{w},\mathit{pst}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon},\boldsymbol{\xi}_1,\dots,\boldsymbol{\xi}_{m+\underline{m}})\Big]-\Big[\mathit{pl}_\infty\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon}(\mathbf{w},\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon})+\sum_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}}\mathit{pl}_i\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_i(\mathbf{w},\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big]\\
&=\hat{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon\Big[\mathit{pst}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon},\boldsymbol{\xi}_1,\dots,\boldsymbol{\xi}_{m+\underline{m}})\Big]-\Big[\mathit{pl}_\infty\hat{\mathscr{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon})+\sum_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}}\mathit{pl}_i\hat{\mathscr{D}}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Here the last inequality follows from the property of the perturbation term. We estimate the last line in different regions as follows.

(a) Inside $B^i_{\epsilon;b}:=B^i_{\epsilon;0}\setminus\mathrm{supp}\chi^\epsilon_\infty$, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon\Big[\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\epsilon^{\mathrm{app}}(\boldsymbol{\nu})\Big]-\boldsymbol{\nu}=\hat{\mathscr{D}}_{\mathbf{v}'_{i,\epsilon}}\Big[\mathit{pl}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big]-\mathit{pl}_i\Big[\hat{\mathscr{D}}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big]$$

while we can write $\mathbf{v}'_{i,\epsilon}=\exp_{\mathbf{v}_i}\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{i,\epsilon}$ and Lemma 5.1 says that

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to0}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{i,\epsilon}\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_m(\mathbb{A}_i)}=0.$$

Then by using the same method as proving Proposition 5.7, we have

$$\Big\|\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon\Big[\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\epsilon^{\mathrm{app}}(\boldsymbol{\nu})\Big]-\boldsymbol{\nu}\Big\|_{L^{p,\delta;\epsilon}_m(B^i_{\epsilon;b})}\leqslant c_{i,b}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{i,\epsilon}\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_m(B^i_{\epsilon;0})}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_m(\mathbb{A}_i)}. \tag{5.50}$$

(b) Inside $\Sigma_{\epsilon;b}:=\Sigma_{\epsilon;0}\setminus\bigcup_{i=1}^{m+\underline{m}}\mathrm{supp}\chi^\epsilon_i$, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon\Big[\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\epsilon^{\mathrm{app}}(\boldsymbol{\nu})\Big]-\boldsymbol{\nu}=\hat{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon\Big[\mathit{pl}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon})\Big]-\mathit{pl}_\infty\Big[\hat{\mathscr{D}}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon})\Big]$$

while we can write $\mathbf{v}'_{\infty,\epsilon}=\exp_{\mathbf{v}_{\infty,\epsilon}}\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{\infty,\epsilon}$ and Lemma 5.1 says that

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to0}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(\Sigma)}=0.$$

Similar to the above case, for ϵ sufficiently small,

$$\Big\|\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon(\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\epsilon^{\mathrm{app}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}))-\boldsymbol{\nu}\Big\|_{L^{p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(\Sigma_{\epsilon;b})}\leqslant c_{\infty,b}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(\Sigma_{\epsilon;b})}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{1;\epsilon}. \tag{5.51}$$

(c) In one of remaining the neck regions, i.e., $N^i_\epsilon:=\mathrm{supp}\chi^\epsilon_\infty\cap\mathrm{supp}\chi^\epsilon_i$, by our construction of the approximate solution, $\mathbf{v}_\epsilon=\mathbf{c}_i=(d+\lambda_i d\theta_i,e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i}x_i)$. By definition of pst,

$$\mathit{pst}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon},\boldsymbol{\xi}_1,\dots,\boldsymbol{\xi}_{m+\underline{m}})=\begin{bmatrix}\chi^\epsilon_\infty\mathit{pl}^H_\infty(\xi^H_{\infty,\epsilon}(z))+\chi^\epsilon_i(z)\mathit{pl}^H_i(\xi^H_i(z))-e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i}\xi^H_i\\ \chi^\epsilon_\infty(z)\mathit{pl}^G_\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_{\infty,\epsilon}(z))+\chi^\epsilon_i(z)\mathit{pl}^G_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}^G_i(z))\end{bmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\hat{\mathscr{D}}_\epsilon(e^{-\lambda_i\theta_i}\xi^H_i)=0.$$

Therefore (abbreviating $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ by $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\infty$ and abbreviating $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ by $\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty$),

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Big\|\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_\epsilon\Big[\widetilde{\mathbb{Q}}_\epsilon^{\mathrm{app}}(\boldsymbol{\nu})\Big]-\boldsymbol{\nu}\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}\\
=&\Big\|\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\epsilon\Big[\chi_\infty^\epsilon \mathfrak{pl}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty)+\chi_i^\epsilon \mathfrak{pl}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big]-\mathfrak{pl}_\infty\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty)\Big]-\mathfrak{pl}_i\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big]\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}\\
\leqslant&\Big\|\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\epsilon\Big[\chi_\infty^\epsilon \mathfrak{pl}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty)\Big]-\mathfrak{pl}_\infty\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty)\Big]\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}+\Big\|\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\epsilon\Big[\chi_i^\epsilon \mathfrak{pl}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big]-\mathfrak{pl}_i\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big]\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}\\
\leqslant&\Big\|\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\epsilon\Big[\chi_\infty^\epsilon \mathfrak{pl}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty)\Big]-\mathfrak{pl}_\infty\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\infty(\chi_\infty^\epsilon\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty)\Big]\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}+\Big\|\mathfrak{pl}_\infty\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty-\chi_\infty^\epsilon\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty)\Big]\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}\\
&+\Big\|\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\epsilon\Big[\chi_i^\epsilon \mathfrak{pl}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big]-\mathfrak{pl}_i\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_i(\chi_i^\epsilon\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big]\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}+\Big\|\mathfrak{pl}_i\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i-\chi_i^\epsilon\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big]\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}\\
=&\Big\|\chi_\infty^\epsilon\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\epsilon[\mathfrak{pl}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty)]-\mathfrak{pl}_\infty[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty)]\Big]\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}+\Big\|\mathfrak{pl}_\infty\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty-\chi_\infty^\epsilon\boldsymbol{\xi}_\infty)\Big]\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}\\
&+\Big\|\chi_i^\epsilon\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\epsilon[\mathfrak{pl}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)]-\mathfrak{pl}_i[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)]\Big]\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}+\Big\|\mathfrak{pl}_i\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i-\chi_i^\epsilon\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big]\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}
\end{aligned}
$$

The first and the third term can be bounded by the same method of deriving (5.50) and (5.51), which gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Big\|\chi_\infty^\epsilon\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\epsilon[\mathfrak{pl}_\infty(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon})]-\mathfrak{pl}_\infty[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon})]\Big]\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}&\leqslant c_{\infty,b}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{L_m^{1,p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{1;\epsilon};\\
\Big\|\chi_i^\epsilon\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_\epsilon[\mathfrak{pl}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)]-\mathfrak{pl}_i[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)]\Big]\Big\|_{L_m^{p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}&\leqslant c_{i,b}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}'_{i,\epsilon}\|_{L_m^{1,p,\delta;\epsilon}(N_\epsilon^i)}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_{L_m^{1,p,\delta}(\mathbb{A}_i)}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.52}
$$

To estimate the second and the fourth term, notice that $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)=0$ outside $B^i_{\epsilon;0}$, we have

$$
\hat{\mathcal{D}}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i-\chi_i^\epsilon\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)=\begin{bmatrix}-(\overline{\partial}\chi_i^\epsilon)\xi_i\\(\partial_s\chi_i^\epsilon)\phi_i+(\partial_t\chi_i^\epsilon)\psi_i\\(\partial_s\chi_i^\epsilon)\psi_i-(\partial_t\chi_i^\epsilon)\phi_i\end{bmatrix}.
$$

Therefore, similar to Lemma 5.14,

$$
\Big\|\mathfrak{pl}_i\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}_i-\chi_i^\epsilon\boldsymbol{\xi}_i)\Big]\Big\|_{0;\epsilon}\leqslant\|\nabla_c\chi_i^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_{L_m^{1,p,\delta}}\leqslant\frac{2}{\log e}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_{L_m^{1,p,\delta}}.
\tag{5.53}
$$

Here $\nabla_c\chi_i^\epsilon$ is the gradient in the cylindrical coordinates. Similarly,

$$
\Big\|\mathfrak{pl}_\infty\Big[\hat{\mathcal{D}}_{\infty,\epsilon}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}-\chi_\infty^\epsilon\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon})\Big]\Big\|_{0;\epsilon}\leqslant\|\nabla_c\chi_\infty^\epsilon\|_{L^\infty}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{1;\epsilon}\leqslant\frac{2}{\log e}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\infty,\epsilon}\|_{1;\epsilon}.
\tag{5.54}
$$

Putting all above estimates together, we obtain the second inequality of (5.45). □

5.9. **Proof of Theorem 5.11.** For simplicity, we assume that the stable affine vortex $\mathbf{v}_\circ$ has only two components, the disk component $\mathbf{v}_\infty=(u_\infty,a_\infty)$ and an $\mathbb{H}$-vortex component $\underline{\mathbf{v}}=(\underline{u},\underline{a})$. By adding extra marked points to stabilize the configuration, one may assume that there exists a sequence of gluing parameters ϵ_i which converges to zero, such that the sequence of underlying marked curves of $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ are obtained from the underlying

marked curve of $\mathbf{v}_\infty$ by smoothing using the gluing parameters ϵ_i. The case that $\mathbf{v}_\circ$ has more components (including $\mathbb{C}$-vortices) can be proved in the same way. We assume that

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} u(z) = \lim_{z\to 0} u_\infty(z) = x_0 \in L.$$

We also assume that $\mathbf{v}_\infty$ are smooth over $\mathbb{H}$.

5.9.1. *The neck region.* We transform $\underline{\mathbf{v}}$ into the gauge that satisfies Lemma 4.1 (b). Then we have

$$\|\underline{\phi}\|_{L_G^{1,p,\delta}(\mathbb{H})} + \|\underline{\psi}\|_{L_G^{1,p,\delta}(\mathbb{H})} < +\infty.$$

Moreover, transform $\mathbf{v}_\infty$ into the gauge such that

Let $R > 0$ be sufficiently big so that $u(C_R)$ and $u_\infty(B_{\frac{1}{R}})$ are contained in a very small neighborhood of x_0. Then we can write

$$\underline{u}(z) = \exp_{x_0} \underline{\xi},\ \forall z \in C_R; \qquad\qquad u_\infty(z) = \exp_{x_0} \xi_\infty,\ \forall z \in B_{\frac{1}{R}}.$$

Without loss of generality, assume that the nodal point on the disk component is $\underline{z} = 0 \in \partial\mathbb{H}$. For each i, the corresponding gluing parameter ϵ_i is given by the convergence of the underlying marked curve. We consider the behavior of the restrictions of $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ onto the neck regions (considered as subsets of $\mathbb{H}$)

$$N_{i,R} := B\Big(\frac{1}{\epsilon_i R}\Big) \smallsetminus B(R),\ N_i^- = B\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon_i}}\Big) \smallsetminus B(R),\ N_i^+ = B\Big(\frac{1}{\epsilon_i R}\Big) \smallsetminus B\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon_i}}\Big).$$

Let (τ, θ) be the cylindrical coordinates on N_i with range

$$\log R \leqslant \tau \leqslant -\log \epsilon_i - \log R.$$

We transform $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ on N_i in to temporal gauge. Moreover, we require that $\psi^{(i)}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}, \theta) \equiv 0$. Then the vortex equation reads

$$\partial_\tau u^{(i)} + J_X(\partial_\theta u^{(i)} + \mathfrak{X}_{\psi^{(i)}}) = 0,\ \partial_s \psi^{(i)} + e^{2\tau}\mu(u^{(i)}) = 0.$$

Denote temporarily its energy density function as

$$e_i(\tau, \theta) = |\partial_\tau u^{(i)}(\tau, \theta)|^2 + e^{2\tau}|\mu(u^{(i)}(\tau, \theta))|^2.$$

For R and i sufficiently large, $u^{(i)}(N_{i,R})$ is contained in a small neighborhood of x. Then we can apply the annulus lemma (see Lemma A.2), which implies that

$$e_i(\tau, \theta) \lesssim R^\delta e^{-\delta \min\{\tau, -\log \epsilon_i - \tau\}},\ \log(2R) \leqslant \tau \leqslant -\log(2\epsilon_i R). \tag{5.55}$$

$$\underline{e}(\tau, \theta) \lesssim R^\delta e^{-\delta\tau},\ \log(2R) \leqslant \tau < +\infty. \tag{5.56}$$

We also have similar decays for the energy density of $\mathbf{v}_\infty$. Moreover, we can write, for large i, that

$$\mathbf{v}^{(i)}|_{N_{i,R}} = \exp_{\mathbf{v}_{\epsilon_i}} \boldsymbol{\xi}_i,\ \boldsymbol{\xi}_i = (\xi_i, \alpha_i).$$

Lemma 5.15. *For any $\alpha > 0$, there exists $R_\alpha > R$ and $i_\alpha > 0$ such that for $i \geqslant i_\alpha$*

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(i)}\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(N_{i,R_\alpha})} \leqslant \alpha.$$

Proof. Basically, since the energy decays exponentially near the node, and the decay rate is uniform among all i. Then $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$, $\underline{\mathbf{v}}$ and $\mathbf{v}_\infty$ are (exponentially) close to the constant vortex at $\underline{x}$. Therefore, the norm of $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(i)}$ decays exponentially. To derive the estimate precisely, one also needs the *a priori* estimate given in Lemma B.1. The detail is left to the reader. We remark that we do not need a specific gauge for $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ because over the neck region $N_{i,R}$ their energies can be as small as we want. □

5.9.2. *Near infinity.* Now for $R < R_\alpha$, define $\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}^{(i)} \in \widetilde{\mathscr{M}}(C_{1/R}, \epsilon_i^{-2}; X, L)$ by

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}^{(i)} = (\widetilde{u}^{(i)}, \widetilde{a}^{(i)}) = (s^*_{\epsilon_i})^{-1}\mathbf{v}^{(i)}.$$

Firstly, we have two lemmas whose proofs are left to the reader.

Lemma 5.16. *For each $\alpha > 0$, there exists $c_\alpha > 0$ such that*

$$\limsup_{i\to\infty}\limsup_{z\to\infty}|z|^{4-\alpha}\left[|\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}^{(i)}_s|^2 + \epsilon_i^{-2}|\mu(\widetilde{u}^{(i)})|^2\right] < +\infty.$$

Lemma 5.17. *$\widetilde{u}^{(i)}$ converges to u_∞ uniformly on $C_{1/R}$ and $\lim_{i\to\infty}\mathrm{ev}_\infty(\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}^{(i)}) = \mathrm{ev}_\infty(\mathbf{v}_\infty) \in \bar{L}$.*

Therefore, by the same method of proving Lemma 5.15, we have

Lemma 5.18. *For any $\alpha > 0$, there exist $R'_\alpha > 0$ and i'_α such that, for $i \geqslant i'_\alpha$, we can write $\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}^{(i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{v}_\infty}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i$ and*

$$\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(i)}\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{\mathrm{aux};\epsilon}(C_{R'_\alpha})} \leqslant \alpha.$$

5.9.3. *In the compact region.* Without loss of generality, assume that $i_\alpha = i'_\alpha$ and $R_\alpha = R'_\alpha$. Consider the convergence over the compact region B_{R_α}, which is part of the domain of $\underline{\mathbf{v}}$. Since the expression of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}}$ restricted to B_{R_α} has no dependence on ϵ_i and is equivalent to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^{1,p}(B_{R_\alpha})}$, using standard elliptic theory, we can show that (up to gauge transformations)

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(i)}\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_{m;\epsilon}(B_{R_\alpha})} = 0.$$

On the other hand, we compare $\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}^{(i)}$ with $\mathbf{v}_\infty$ over $\Omega = B_{R_\alpha} \smallsetminus B_{\frac{1}{R_\alpha}}$. Using the graph construction (see [6, Appendix A]), we may regard all the perturbed vortices as unperturbed vortices with target $X \times \mathbb{C}$ with the Lagrangian $L \times \mathbb{R}$. So without loss of generality, assume that the perturbation term vanishes. We write $\widetilde{\mathbf{v}}^{(i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{v}_\infty}\widetilde{\xi}^{(i)}$ where $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(i)} = (\widetilde{\xi}^{(i)}, \widetilde{\alpha}^{(i)})$. Let the H_X component of $\widetilde{\xi}^{(i)}$ be $\widetilde{\xi}^{(i)}_H$, the G_X components be $\widetilde{\xi}^{(i)}_G$. Then Theorem B.8 implies that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\left[\|\widetilde{\xi}^{(i)}_H\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \epsilon_i^{-1}\|\widetilde{\xi}^{(i)}_G\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\nabla\widetilde{\xi}^{(i)}_G\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\widetilde{\alpha}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \epsilon_i\|\nabla^{A_\infty}\widetilde{\alpha}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(\Omega)}\right] = 0.$$

Rescale back, it implies that the distance between $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{\infty,\epsilon}$ over Ω converges to zero. This finishes the proof of Theorem 5.11.

Appendix A. Technical Results about Vortices

A.1. **A Hardy-type Inequality.** In the gluing construction we frequently used the following result.

Proposition A.1. *Given $p > 2$, $\delta > 1 - \frac{2}{p}$. If $f \in W^{1,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{C})$ satisfies $\|\nabla f\|_{L^{p,\delta}} < \infty$, then the limit $f(\infty) := \lim_{z\to\infty} f(z)$ exists and $f - f(\infty) \in L^{p,\delta-1}$. Moreover, there hold the following estimates.*

(a) There exists $c > 0$ (independent of f) such that

$$\|f - f(\infty)\|_{L^{p,\delta-1}} \leqslant c\|\nabla f\|_{L^{p,\delta}}.$$

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leqslant c|x|^{1-\delta-\frac{2}{p}}\|\nabla f\|_{L^{p,\delta}(B^{\complement}_{|x|})}, \ \forall x, y \in \mathbb{C}, \ 0 < |x| \leqslant |y|.$$

(b) There is an equivalence of norms

$$\|f\|_{L^\infty} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^{p,\delta}} \approx |f(\infty)| + \|f - f(\infty)\|_{L^{p,\delta-1}} + \|\nabla f\|_{L^{p,\delta}}.$$

A.2. **Annulus Lemma.** For $1 \leqslant r < R < \infty$, denote

$$A(r,R) := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid r < |z| < R\}, \ A^+(r,R) := \{z \in \mathbb{H} \mid r < |z| < R\}.$$

Let $L \subset X$ be a K-Lagrangian.

Lemma A.2. *(a) (cf. [28, Proposition 45]) There exist $\epsilon_X > 0$ and for any small $\delta > 0$ a constant $a_X = a_X(\delta) > 0$ such that for any $\mathbf{v} = (u, a) \in \widetilde{\mathscr{M}}(A(r,R); X)$ satisfying $E(\mathbf{v}) \leqslant \epsilon_X$, then for $s \in [\log 2, \log\sqrt{R/r}]$ one has*

$$E\Big(\mathbf{v}; A(e^s r, e^{-s}R)\Big) \leqslant a_X e^{-(2-\delta)s} E\Big(\mathbf{v}; A(r,R)\Big);$$

$$\mathrm{diam}_K\Big(u(A(e^s r, e^{-s}R)\Big) \leqslant a_X e^{-(1-\delta)s}\sqrt{E\big(\mathbf{v}; A(r,R)\big)}.$$

(b) (cf. [16, Proposition A.11]) There exist $\epsilon_{X,L} > 0$ and for any small $\delta > 0$ a constant $a_{X,L} = a_{X,L}(\delta) > 0$ such that for any $\underline{\mathbf{v}} = (\underline{u}, \underline{a}) \in \widetilde{\mathscr{M}}(A^+(r,R); X, L)$ satisfying $E(\mathbf{v}) \leqslant \epsilon_{X,L}$, then for $s \in [\log 2, \log\sqrt{R/r}]$ one has

$$E\Big(\underline{\mathbf{v}}; A^+(e^s r, e^{-s}R)\Big) \leqslant a_{X,L} e^{-(2-\delta)s} E\Big(\underline{\mathbf{v}}; A^+(r,R)\Big);$$

$$\mathrm{diam}_K\Big(\underline{u}(A^+(e^s r, e^{-s}R)\Big) \leqslant a_{X,L} e^{-(1-\delta)s}\sqrt{E\big(\underline{\mathbf{v}}; A^+(r,R)\big)}.$$

Appendix B. Technical Results about Adiabatic Limits

B.1. *a priori* **estimates.** Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{H}$ be an open subset and let $\sigma : \Omega \to (0, +\infty)$ be a smooth function. For $l \geqslant 0$, assume that there exists $c_l(\sigma) > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{c_0(\sigma)} \leqslant \sigma \leqslant c_0(\sigma), \qquad\qquad \sup_{z\in\Omega} |\nabla^{(l)}\sigma(z)| \leqslant c_l(\sigma).$$

For any gauged map $\mathbf{v} = (u, \phi, \psi)$ from Ω to X, denote

$$\mathbf{v}_s = \partial_s u + \mathfrak{X}_\phi, \ \mathbf{v}_t = \partial_t u + \mathfrak{X}_\psi, \ \kappa = \partial_s\psi - \partial_t\phi + [\phi, \psi].$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be a (small) constant. Consider the local form of the perturbed vortex equation

$$\mathbf{v}_s + J\mathbf{v}_t = 0,\ \kappa + \epsilon^{-2}\sigma\mu(u) = 0,\ u(\partial\Omega) \subset L. \tag{B.1}$$

Let $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}}(\Omega, \epsilon^{-2}\sigma; X, L)$ be the set of smooth solutions to (B.1). On the other hand, let $\widetilde{\mathscr{M}}(\Omega, \infty; X, L)$ be the set of solutions to

$$\mathbf{v}_s + J\mathbf{v}_t = 0,\ \mu(u) \equiv 0,\ u(\partial\Omega) \subset L.$$

On the target set, let $X^{ss} \subset X$ be the open subset consisting of $x \in X$ for which $a \mapsto \mathfrak{X}_a(x)$ is injective. For each $M > 0$, define

$$U_M := \Big\{ x \in X^{ss} \mid \frac{1}{M}|a| \leqslant |\mathfrak{X}_a(x)|,\ \forall a \in \mathfrak{k} \Big\}.$$

Lemma B.1. *(cf. [6, Lemma 9.3]) For any $M > 0$, there exist $c(M, \Omega, K) > 0$ and $\epsilon(M)$, which also depend on the constants $c_l(\sigma)$, that satisfies the following condition. Suppose $\epsilon \in (0, \epsilon(M)]$ and $\mathbf{v}$ is a solution to (B.1) over Ω such that*

$$u(\Omega) \subset U_M,\ \sup_{z\in\Omega}\Big[|\mathbf{v}_s(z)| + \frac{\sqrt{\sigma(z)}}{\epsilon}|\mu(u(z))|\Big] \leqslant M.$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{\epsilon}\|\mu(u)\|_{L^p(K)} + \|d\mu(u)\cdot\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)} + \|d\mu(u)\cdot J\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)} + \epsilon\|\nabla^a_s\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)} + \epsilon\|\nabla^a_t\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)}$$
$$\leqslant c(M,\Omega,K)\epsilon^{\frac{2}{p}}\Big[\|\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \epsilon^{-1}\|\mu(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big]. \tag{B.2}$$

Remark B.2. Lemma B.1 was proved in [6] for Ω with empty boundary. The proof in the case that $\partial\Omega \neq \varnothing$ is essentially the same. However, in the proof one has to use a (J_X, L, μ)-admissible metric and the associated Levi-Civita connection, instead of any K-invariant metric and its Levi-Civita connection.

B.2. **Projection to $\mu^{-1}(0)$.** Now suppose one has a gauged map $\mathbf{v}$ from Ω to X with $\sup_\Omega |\mu(u)|$ is sufficiently small. Then there is a unique function $h : \Omega \to \mathfrak{k}$ such that

$$\mu(\exp_u J\mathfrak{X}_h) \equiv 0.$$

Define $\dot{\mathbf{v}} = (\dot{u}, \dot{a})$ where $\dot{a}$ is the connection pulled back by $\dot{u}$. Then it is easy to see that for all $K \subset \Omega$,

$$\|J\mathfrak{X}_h\|_{L^p(K)} \lesssim \|\mu(u)\|_{L^p(K)} \tag{B.3}$$

Lemma B.3. *Under the hypothesis of Lemma B.1, one has*

$$\|\nabla^a(J\mathfrak{X}_h)\|_{L^p(K)} \leqslant c(M,\Omega,K)\Big[\|\mu(u)\|_{L^p(K)} + \|d\mu(u)\cdot\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)}\Big].$$

Proof. Denote $\dot\eta ds + \dot\zeta dt = a - \dot a$. Then by Lemma C.3,

$$\mathfrak{X}_{\dot\eta} + \dot{\mathbf{v}}_s - E_1(\mathbf{v}_s) - E_2\nabla^a_s(J\mathfrak{X}_h) = \mathfrak{X}_{\dot\zeta} + \dot{\mathbf{v}}_t - E_1(\mathbf{v}_t) - E_2\nabla^a_t(J\mathfrak{X}_h) = 0. \tag{B.4}$$

Since $\dot u$ is contained in $\mu^{-1}(0)$, applying $d\mu(\dot u)$ to the above identities gives

$$d\mu(\dot u)\cdot E_2\nabla^a_s(J\mathfrak{X}_h) = -d\mu(\dot u)\cdot E_1(\mathbf{v}_s),$$

$$d\mu(\dot{u})\cdot E_2\nabla_t^a(J\mathfrak{X}_h) = -d\mu(\dot{u})\cdot E_1(\mathbf{v}_t).$$

By the smoothness of $d\mu$, one has

$$|d\mu(\dot{u})\cdot E_2\nabla_s^a(J\mathfrak{X}_h) - d\mu(u)\cdot\nabla_s^a(J\mathfrak{X}_h)| \lesssim |J\mathfrak{X}_h||\nabla_s^a(J\mathfrak{X}_h)|.$$

$$|d\mu(\dot{u})\cdot E_1(\mathbf{v}_s) - d\mu(u)\cdot\mathbf{v}_s| \lesssim |J\mathfrak{X}_h||\mathbf{v}_s|.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h| &\lesssim |d\mu(u)\cdot\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h| + |\mathbf{v}_s||J\mathfrak{X}_h| \\
&\lesssim |d\mu(\dot{u})E_2(\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h)| + |J\mathfrak{X}_h||\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h| + |\mathbf{v}_s||J\mathfrak{X}_h| \\
&\lesssim |d\mu(\dot{u})\cdot E_1(\mathbf{v}_s)| + |J\mathfrak{X}_h||\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h| + |J\mathfrak{X}_h||\mathbf{v}_s| \\
&\lesssim |d\mu(u)\cdot\mathbf{v}_s| + |J\mathfrak{X}_h||\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h| + |J\mathfrak{X}_h||\mathbf{v}_s|
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, when $|J\mathfrak{X}_h|$ is sufficiently small,

$$|\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h| \lesssim |d\mu(u)\cdot\mathbf{v}_s| + |\mathbf{v}_s||J\mathfrak{X}_h|.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_s^a(J\mathfrak{X}_h)\|_{L^p(K)} \lesssim \|\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\|J\mathfrak{X}_h\|_{L^p(K)} + \|d\mu(u)\cdot\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)} \\
\lesssim \|\mu(u)\|_{L^p(K)} + \|d\mu(u)\cdot\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The bound of $\nabla_t^a(J\mathfrak{X}_h)$ can be proved similarly. □

The gauged map $\dot{\mathbf{v}}$ is nearly holomorphic and one needs to estimate its failure.

Corollary B.4. *Under the hypothesis of Lemma B.1, one has*

$$\|\dot{\mathbf{v}}_s + J\dot{\mathbf{v}}_t\|_{L^p(K)} \lesssim \|\mu(u)\|_{L^p(K)} + \|d\mu(u)\cdot\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)} + \|d\mu(u)\cdot\mathbf{v}_t\|_{L^p(K)}.$$

Proof. Since $\dot{\mathbf{v}}_s$ and $\dot{\mathbf{v}}_t$ are contained in H_X, (B.4) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\mathbf{v}}_s + J\dot{\mathbf{v}}_t &= P_H\Big[E_1(\mathbf{v}_s) + E_2(\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h) + JE_1(\mathbf{v}_t) + JE_2(\nabla_t^a J\mathfrak{X}_h)\Big] \\
&= P_H\Big[(JE_1 - E_1J)(\mathbf{v}_t) + E_2(\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h) + JE_2(\nabla_t^a J\mathfrak{X}_h)\Big]
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\dot{\mathbf{v}}_s + J\dot{\mathbf{v}}_t\|_{L^p(K)} &\lesssim \|J\mathfrak{X}_h\|_{L^p(K)}\|\mathbf{v}_t\|_{L^\infty(K)} + \|\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla_t^a J\mathfrak{X}_h\|_{L^p(K)} \\
&\lesssim \|\mu(u)\|_{L^p(K)} + \|d\mu\cdot\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)} + \|d\mu(u)\cdot\mathbf{v}_t\|_{L^p(K)}
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof. □

Lemma B.5. *One has*

$$\|\dot{\eta}\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\dot{\zeta}\|_{L^p(K)} \leqslant C(M,\Omega,K)\epsilon^{\frac{2}{p}}\Big[\|\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \epsilon^{-1}\|\mu(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big].$$

Proof. By (B.4), since $\dot{\mathbf{v}}_s$ is contained in H_X, one has

$$d\mu(\dot{u}) \cdot J\mathfrak{X}_\eta = d\mu(\dot{u}) \cdot JE_1(\mathbf{v}_s) + d\mu(\dot{u}) \cdot JE_2\nabla_s^a(J\mathfrak{X}_h) \tag{B.5}$$

Since $\eta \mapsto d\mu(\dot{u}) \cdot J\mathfrak{X}_\eta$ is an isomorphism,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\dot{\eta}| &\lesssim |d\mu(\dot{u}) \cdot JE_1(\mathbf{v}_s)| + |d\mu(\dot{u}) \cdot JE_2\nabla_s^a(J\mathfrak{X}_h)| \\
&\lesssim |d\mu(u) \cdot J\mathbf{v}_s| + |J\mathfrak{X}_h||\mathbf{v}_s| + |d\mu(u) \cdot J\nabla_s^a(J\mathfrak{X}_h)| + |J\mathfrak{X}_h||\nabla_s^a(J\mathfrak{X}_h)| \\
&\lesssim |d\mu(u) \cdot J\mathbf{v}_s| + |\mu(u)| + |\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h|
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by Corollary B.1 and Lemma B.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\dot{\eta}\|_{L^p(K)} &\lesssim \|d\mu(u) \cdot J\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p} + \|\mu(u)\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla_s^a(J\mathfrak{X}_h)\|_{L^p(K)} \\
&\lesssim \|d\mu(u) \cdot J\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\mu(u)\|_{L^p(\Omega')} + \|d\mu(u) \cdot \mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(\Omega')} \\
&\lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{2}{p}}\Big[\|\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \epsilon^{-1}\|\mu(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can derive the estimate for $\dot{\zeta}$. □

Lemma B.6. *One has*

$$\epsilon\Big[\|\nabla_s^a\dot{\eta}\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla_s^a\dot{\zeta}\|_{L^p(K)}\Big] \leqslant c\epsilon^{\frac{2}{p}}\Big[\|\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \epsilon^{-1}\|\mu(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big].$$

Proof. Apply $d\mu(\dot{u})$ to (B.4), one has

$$d\mu(\dot{u}) \cdot E_1(\mathbf{v}_s) + d\mu(\dot{u}) \cdot E_2(\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h) = 0.$$

Then apply ∇_s^a to the above equation, by Lemma C.2, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \nabla_s^a L_{\dot{u}}^* JE_1(\mathbf{v}_s) + \nabla_s^a L_{\dot{u}}^*(JE_2(\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h)) \\
&= L_{\dot{u}}^*\Big[\nabla_s^a(JE_1(\mathbf{v}_s)) + \nabla_s^a JE_2(\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h)\Big] \\
&\quad + \rho\Big(\partial_s\dot{u} + \mathfrak{X}_\phi, JE_1(\mathbf{v}_s) + JE_2(\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h)\Big) \\
&= L_{\dot{u}}^*\Big[JE_1(\nabla_s^a\mathbf{v}_s) + \Phi_1(\mathbf{v}_s, \mathbf{v}_s) + \Phi_2(\mathbf{v}_s, \nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h)\Big] \\
&\quad + L_{\dot{u}}^*\Big[JE_2(\nabla_s^a\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h) + \Psi_1(\mathbf{v}_s, \nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h) + \Psi_2(\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h, \nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h)\Big] \\
&\quad + \rho\Big(\partial_s\dot{u} + \mathfrak{X}_\phi, JE_1(\mathbf{v}_s) + JE_2(\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h)\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\Phi_1, \Phi_2, \Psi_1, \Psi_2$ are tensors that are uniformly bounded. Using the facts that E_2 is very close to the identity, that $|\mathbf{v}_s|$, $|\partial_s\dot{u} + \mathfrak{X}_\phi|$, and $|\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h|$ are bounded, one has

$$\|\nabla_s^a\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h\|_{L^p(K)} \lesssim \|\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla_s^a\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)}. \tag{B.6}$$

Then apply $\nabla_s^a L_{\dot{u}}$ to (B.4), one has

$$\nabla_s^a L_{\dot{u}}^*\mathfrak{X}_{\dot{\eta}} = \nabla_s^a L_{\dot{u}}^* E_1(\mathbf{v}_s) + \nabla_s^a L_{\dot{u}}^* E_2\nabla_s^a(J\mathfrak{X}_h),$$

so

$$L_{\dot{u}}^*\Big[\nabla_s^a\mathfrak{X}_{\dot{\eta}} - \nabla_s^a E_1(\mathbf{v}_s) - \nabla_s^a E_2\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h\Big] = \rho\Big[\partial_s\dot{u} + \mathfrak{X}_\phi, \mathfrak{X}_{\dot{\eta}} - E_1(\mathbf{v}_s) - E_2\nabla_s^a J\mathfrak{X}_h\Big].$$

Moreover, using Lemma C.2, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_s^a\dot\eta\|_{L^p(K)} &\lesssim \|\nabla_s^a\mathfrak{X}_{\dot\eta}\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla_{\mathbf{v}_s}\mathfrak{X}_{\dot\eta}\|_{L^p(K)}\\ &\lesssim \|L_{\dot u}^*\nabla_s^a\mathfrak{X}_{\dot\eta}\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\dot\eta\|_{L^p(K)}\\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla_s^a\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)} + \|J\mathfrak{X}_h\|_{L^p(K)}\\ &\quad + \|\nabla_s^aJ\mathfrak{X}_h\| + \|\nabla_s^a\nabla_s^aJ\mathfrak{X}_h\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\dot\eta\|_{L^p(K)}\\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla_s^a\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^p(K)} + \|J\mathfrak{X}_h\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla_s^aJ\mathfrak{X}_h\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\dot\eta\|_{L^p(K)}\\ &\lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{2}{p}-1}\Big[\|\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \epsilon^{-1}\|\mu(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can derive the estimate for $\nabla^a\dot\zeta$. □

Lemma B.7. *We have*

$$\|\nabla^a\dot{\mathbf{v}}_s\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla^a\dot{\mathbf{v}}_t\|_{L^p(K)} \lesssim \epsilon^{\frac{2}{p}-1}\Big[\|\mathbf{v}_s\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \epsilon^{-1}\|\mu(u)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\Big].$$

Proof. We only prove one bound. Apply ∇_s^a to (B.4), one has

$$\nabla_s^a\dot{\mathbf{v}}_s = -\nabla_s^a\mathfrak{X}_{\dot\eta} + E_1(\nabla_s^a\mathbf{v}_s) + E_2(\nabla_s^a\nabla_s^aJ\mathfrak{X}_h) + \Phi_1(\mathbf{v}_s,\mathbf{v}_s) + \Phi_2(\mathbf{v}_s,\nabla_s^aJ\mathfrak{X}_h).$$

where Φ_1,Φ_2 are K-invariant tensors that are uniformly bounded. This allows us to prove the desired estimates from previous results. □

B.3. **Convergence.** Let ϵ_i be a sequence of positive numbers that converges to zero. Consider a sequence of vortices $\mathbf{v}^{(i)} = (u^{(i)},\phi^{(i)},\psi^{(i)}) \in \widetilde{\mathscr{M}}(\Omega,\epsilon_i^{-2}\sigma;X,L)$ that converges to a gauged map $\mathbf{v}_\infty = (u_\infty,\phi_\infty,\psi_\infty) \in \widetilde{\mathscr{M}}(\Omega,\infty;X,L)$ uniformly on compact subsets of Ω. We would like to prove the following theorem.

Theorem B.8. *There exists $i_0 \geqslant 1$ such that for all $i \geqslant i_0$, we can gauge transform $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ to a sequence of vortices (which we still denoted by $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$) such that, if we denote*

$$\mathbf{v}^{(i)} = \exp_{\mathbf{v}_\infty}\boldsymbol{\xi}^{(i)},\ \ \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(i)} = (\xi^{(i)},\alpha^{(i)}),$$

then for any compact subset $K \subset \Omega$,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\Big[\|\alpha^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)} + \epsilon_i\|\nabla^{A_\infty}\alpha^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\xi_H^{(i)}\|_{L^{1,p}(K)} + \epsilon_i^{-1}\|\xi_G^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla^{A_\infty}\xi_G^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)}\Big] = 0.$$

To start, we first gauge transform $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ to satisfy the following pointwise gauge-fixing condition. Let $\dot{\mathbf{v}}^{(i)} = (\dot u^{(i)},\dot a^{(i)})$ be the projection of $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ onto $\mu^{-1}(0)$. Namely, there are $h_i : C_R \to \mathfrak{k}$ such that $\dot u^{(i)} = \exp_{u^{(i)}} J\mathfrak{X}_{h_i}$ is contained in $\mu^{-1}(0)$ and $\dot a^{(i)}$ is pulled back by $\dot u^{(i)}$. The gauge-fixing condition is that if we write $\dot u^{(i)} = \exp_{u_\infty}\dot\xi^{(i)}$, then

$$\dot\xi^{(i)} \in u_\infty^* H_X.$$

This is the gauge that allows us to have the estimates in Theorem B.8. To prove them, we compare $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ with $\dot{\mathbf{v}}^{(i)}$ and compare $\dot{\mathbf{v}}^{(i)}$ with $\mathbf{v}_\infty$ separately.

The vortex equation for $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ reads

$$\mathbf{v}_s^{(i)} + J\mathbf{v}_t^{(i)} = 0,\ \ \kappa^{(i)} + \epsilon_i^{-2}\sigma\mu(u^{(i)}) = 0.$$

Denote $\dot{\alpha}^{(i)} = a^{(i)} - \dot{a}^{(i)}$. Then by Lemma B.5 and Lemma B.6, one has

$$\limsup_{i\to\infty}\left[\|\dot{\alpha}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)} + \epsilon_i\|\nabla^{a^{(i)}}\dot{\alpha}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)}\right] \leqslant c\epsilon_i^{\frac{2}{p}}\left[\|\mathbf{v}_s^{(i)}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \epsilon_i^{-1}\|\mu(u^{(i)})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\right]. \quad \text{(B.7)}$$

By the uniform bound on energy, the right hand side of (B.7) converges to zero. Similarly, by (B.2), (B.3) and Lemma B.3, one has

$$\epsilon_i^{-1}\|J\mathfrak{X}_{h_i}\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla J\mathfrak{X}_{h_i}\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \lesssim (\epsilon_i)^{\frac{2}{p}}, \quad \text{(B.8)}$$

which converges to zero.

Now we estimate the distance between $\dot{\mathbf{v}}^{(i)}$ and $\mathbf{v}_\infty$.

Lemma B.9. *We have*

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\left[\|\dot{\xi}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla^{A_\infty}\dot{\xi}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)}\right] = 0. \quad \text{(B.9)}$$

Proof. Using Corollary B.4 and elliptic estimate for $\overline{\partial}$ operator. The detail is left to the reader. □

Lemma B.10. *One has*

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\left[\|\dot{a}^{(i)} - a_\infty\|_{L^p(K)} + \epsilon_i\|\nabla^{A_\infty}(\dot{a}^{(i)} - a_\infty)\|_{L^p(K)}\right] = 0. \quad \text{(B.10)}$$

Proof. Since $\dot{a}^{(i)}$ and a_∞ are pulled back by $\dot{u}^{(i)}$ and u_∞, and $\dot{u}^{(i)} = \exp_{u_\infty}\dot{\xi}^{(i)}$, also using Lemma B.9, one has

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\|\dot{a}^{(i)} - a_\infty\|_{L^p(K)} \lesssim \lim_{i\to\infty}\left[\|\dot{\xi}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla^{a_\infty}\dot{\xi}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)}\right] = 0. \quad \text{(B.11)}$$

Denote $\dot{a}^{(i)} - a_\infty = \hat{\eta}^{(i)}ds + \hat{\zeta}^{(i)}dt$. For the derivatives, we only estimate $\|\nabla_t^{a_\infty}\hat{\eta}^{(i)}\|_{L^{p,\delta}(C_R)}$ but the estimates for other components follow easily. By Lemma C.4, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_t^{a_\infty}\hat{\eta}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)} &\lesssim \|L_{u_\infty}^*\mathfrak{X}_{\nabla_t^{a_\infty}\hat{\eta}^{(i)}}\|_{L^p(K)} \\
&\lesssim \|\nabla_t^{a_\infty}\dot{\mathbf{v}}_s^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\hat{\eta}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)} + \|d_{a_\infty}\mathbf{v}_\infty\|_{L^p(K)} \\
&+ \|d_{\dot{a}^{(i)}}\dot{u}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla_t^{a_\infty}\dot{\xi}^{(i)}\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla_s^{a_\infty}\dot{\xi}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)} \\
&+ \|\nabla^{a_\infty}d_{a_\infty}\mathbf{v}_\infty\|_{L^p(K)} + \|L_{u_\infty}^*\nabla_t^{a_\infty}\nabla_s^{a_\infty}\dot{\xi}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)}.
\end{aligned} \quad \text{(B.12)}$$

The right hand side is estimated term by term as follows.

(a) By Lemma B.7 $\|\nabla_t^{a_\infty}\dot{\mathbf{v}}_s^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)} \lesssim \epsilon_i^{\frac{2}{p}-1}$.

(b) The terms $\|d_{a_\infty}\mathbf{v}_\infty\|_{L^p(K)}$ and $\|\nabla^{a_\infty}d_{a_\infty}\mathbf{v}_\infty\|_{L^p(K)}$ are finite. Moreover, since

$$d_{\dot{a}^{(i)}}\dot{u}^{(i)} = L_{\dot{u}^{(i)}}(\dot{a}^{(i)} - a_\infty) + E_1(d_{a_\infty}\mathbf{v}_\infty) + E_2(\nabla^{a_\infty}\dot{\xi}^{(i)}) \quad \text{(B.13)}$$

Using Lemma B.9 and (B.11), $\|d_{\dot{a}^{(i)}}\dot{u}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)}$ is finite.

(c) $\|d_{\dot{a}^{(i)}}\dot{u}^{(i)}\|_{L^\infty}$ is also uniformly bounded. Then (B.13) implies that $\|\nabla^{a_\infty}\dot{\xi}^{(i)}\|_{L^\infty}$ is uniformly bounded. Then by Lemma B.9, $\|\nabla_t^{a_\infty}\dot{\xi}^{(i)}\|_{L^\infty}\|\nabla_s^{a_\infty}\dot{\xi}^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)}$ converges to zero.

(d) Since $L^*_{u_\infty}\dot\xi^{(i)}=0$, by Lemma C.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}L^*_{u_\infty}\nabla_t^{a_\infty}\nabla_s^{a_\infty}\dot\xi^{(i)} &= \nabla_t^{a_\infty}(L^*_{u_\infty}\nabla_s^{a_\infty}\dot\xi^{(i)}) - \rho(\mathbf{v}_{\infty,t},\nabla_s^{a_\infty}\dot\xi^{(i)})\\ &= -\nabla_t^{a_\infty}\rho(\mathbf{v}_{\infty,s},\dot\xi^{(i)}) - \rho(\mathbf{v}_{\infty,t},\nabla_s^{a_\infty}\dot\xi^{(i)}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}&\|L^*_{u_\infty}\nabla_t^{a_\infty}\nabla_s^{a_\infty}\dot\xi^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)}\\ \lesssim\ &\||\mathbf{v}_{\infty,t}||\mathbf{v}_{\infty,s}||\dot\xi^{(i)}|\|_{L^p(K)} + \||\nabla_t^{a_\infty}\mathbf{v}_{\infty,s}||\dot\xi^{(i)}|\|_{L^p(K)} + \||d_{a_\infty}\mathbf{v}_\infty||\nabla^{a_\infty}\dot\xi^{(i)}|\|_{L^p(K)}\\ \lesssim\ &\|\dot\xi^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)} + \|\nabla^{a_\infty}\dot\xi^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)}.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma B.9, it converges to zero.

In summary, $\lim_{i\to\infty}\epsilon_i\|\nabla_t^{a_\infty}\hat\eta^{(i)}\|_{L^p(K)}=0$. This finishes the proof of this lemma. □

Now we consider the distance between $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ and $\mathbf{v}_\infty$. By (B.7) and Lemma B.10,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\left[\|a^{(i)}-a_\infty\|_{L^p(K)} + \epsilon_i\|\nabla^{a_\infty}(a^{(i)}-a_\infty)\|_{L^p(K)}\right]=0. \tag{B.14}$$

On the other hand, we write

$$u^{(i)} = \exp_{u_\infty}\xi^{(i)} = -\exp_{\dot u^{(i)}} J\mathfrak{X}_{h_i} = -\exp_{\exp_{u_\infty}\dot\xi^{(i)}} J\mathfrak{X}_{h_i}.$$

Because of the nonlinearity of the exponential map, $\xi^{(i)}\neq\dot\xi^{(i)}-J\mathfrak{X}_{h_i}$. However, we can define a smooth family of function $\Phi_z : H_{X,u_\infty(z)}\oplus\mathfrak{k}\to T_{X,u_\infty(z)}$ by

$$\xi^{(i)}(z)-\dot\xi^{(i)}(z)+J\mathfrak{X}_{h_i}(u_\infty(z)) = \Phi_z(\dot\xi^{(i)}(z),h_i(z)).$$

Moreover, we know that

$$|\Phi_z(\dot\xi^{(i)}(z),h_i(z))|\lesssim|\dot\xi^{(i)}(z)||h_i(z)|$$

$$|\nabla^{A_\infty}\Phi_z(\dot\xi^{(i)}(z),h_i(z))|\lesssim|d_{A_\infty}u_\infty||\dot\xi^{(i)}||h_i(z)|+|\nabla^{A_\infty}\dot\xi^{(i)}(z)||h_i(z)|+|\dot\xi^{(i)}||\nabla^{A_\infty}h_i(z)|.$$

Roughly speaking, the discrepancy Φ_z is "small." This allows the estimate that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty}\|\pi_H(\xi^{(i)})\|_{L^{1,p,\delta}_H(K)}=0,\ \lim_{i\to\infty}\left[\epsilon_i^{-1}\|\pi_G(\xi^{(i)})\|_{L^{p,\delta}(K)}+\|\nabla\pi_G(\xi^{(i)})\|_{L^{p,\delta}(K)}\right]=0.$$

This finishes the proof of Theorem B.8.

Appendix C. Derivatives of the Exponential Map

This appendix is nearly identical to part of [6, Appendix C], which we include here for convenience. Let M be a complete Riemannian m-manifold. For $v\in T_xM$ and $i,j\in\{1,2\}$ there exist linear maps

$$E_i(x,v):T_xM\to T_{\exp_x v}M,\qquad E_{ij}(x,v):T_xM\oplus T_xM\to T_{\exp_x v}M$$

defined by the following identities

$$\begin{aligned}d\exp_x v &= E_1(x,v)dx + E_2(x,v)\nabla v.\\ \nabla E_1(x,v)w &= E_{11}(x,v)(w,dx)+E_{12}(x,v)(w,\nabla v)+E_1(x,v)\nabla w,\\ \nabla E_2(x,v)w &= E_{21}(x,v)(w,dx)+E_{22}(x,v)(w,\nabla v)+E_2(x,v)\nabla w.\end{aligned}$$

Now let $M = X$ and let g be a K-invariant Riemannian metric. Let ∇ be the Levi-Civita connection of g. By the G-invariance of the metric, one can prove the following identities.

Lemma C.1. *For any $x \in X$, $\xi \in T_xX$, $\eta \in \mathfrak{k}$,*

$$\mathfrak{X}_\eta(\exp_x \xi) = E_1(x,\xi)\mathfrak{X}_\eta(x) + E_2(x,\xi)\nabla_\xi \mathfrak{X}_\eta.$$

Abbreviate the map $\eta \mapsto \mathfrak{X}_\eta(x)$ by L_x and its dual $L_x^*(\xi) = d\mu(x)\cdot J\xi$.
Define a 2-form $\rho \in \Omega^2(X,\mathfrak{k})$ by $\langle \rho(\xi_1,\xi_2),\eta\rangle = \langle \nabla_{\xi_1}\mathfrak{X}_\eta, \xi_2\rangle$.
Let $\mathbf{v} = (u,\phi,\psi) : \mathbb{R}^2 \to X \times \mathfrak{k} \times \mathfrak{k}$ be a smooth map. Denote

$$a = \phi ds + \psi dt;\ \mathbf{v}_s = \partial_s u + \mathfrak{X}_\phi,\ \mathbf{v}_t = \partial_t u + \mathfrak{X}_\psi$$

For $\xi \in \Gamma(u^*TX)$, define

$$\nabla^a_s \xi = \nabla_s \xi + \nabla_\xi \mathfrak{X}_\phi,\ \nabla^a_t \xi = \nabla_t \xi + \nabla_\xi \mathfrak{X}_\psi.$$

Lemma C.2. *For $\eta : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathfrak{k}$, $\xi \in \Gamma(u^*TX)$, one has*

$$\left[\nabla^a_{s/t}, L_u\right](\eta) = \nabla_{\mathbf{v}_{s/t}}\mathfrak{X}_\eta(u), \qquad \left[\nabla^a_{s/t}, L^*_u\right](\xi) = \rho(\mathbf{v}_{s/t},\xi). \tag{C.1}$$

Define $X^* = \{x \in X \mid \ker L_x = \{0\}\}$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}$ be an open subset and let $u_\circ : \Omega \to X^*$ be a C^1-map. Then $u_\circ$ pulls back a connection form $a_\circ = \phi_\circ ds + \psi_\circ dt$ in such a way that if we denote by $\mathbf{v}_\circ = (u_\circ, \phi_\circ, \psi_\circ)$, then

$$\mathbf{v}_{\circ,s} = \partial_s u_\circ + \mathfrak{X}_{\phi_\circ} \in H_X \oplus JK_X,\ \mathbf{v}_{\circ,t} = \partial_t u_\circ + \mathfrak{X}_{\psi_\circ} \in H_X \oplus JK_X.$$

Now suppose $\xi \in E_{u_\circ}$ and $u = \exp_{u_\circ}\xi$; $\eta, \zeta : \Omega \to \mathfrak{k}$ and denote $\phi = \phi_\circ + \eta$, $\psi = \psi_\circ + \zeta$.

Lemma C.3. [6, Lemma C.3]

$$\mathfrak{X}_\eta = \mathbf{v}_s - E_1(\mathbf{v}_{0,s}) - E_2(\nabla^{a_0}_s \xi), \qquad \mathfrak{X}_\zeta = \mathbf{v}_t - E_1(\mathbf{v}_{0,t}) - E_2(\nabla^{a_0}_t \xi)$$

Lemma C.4. [6, Lemma C.5] *Suppose $L^*_{u_\circ}\xi = 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned}
L_u\nabla^a_t\eta = {} & \nabla^a_t \mathbf{v}_s + \nabla_{\mathfrak{X}_\eta}\mathfrak{X}_\zeta - \nabla_{\mathbf{v}_t}\mathfrak{X}_\eta - \nabla_{\mathbf{v}_s}\mathfrak{X}_\zeta - E_{11}(\mathbf{v}_{\circ,s},\mathbf{v}_{\circ,t}) - E_{12}(\mathbf{v}_{\circ,s},\nabla^{a_\circ}_t\xi_\circ) \\
& - E_{21}(\nabla^{a_\circ}_s\xi_\circ,\mathbf{v}_{\circ,t}) - E_{22}(\nabla^{a_\circ}_s\xi_\circ,\nabla^{a_\circ}_t\xi_\circ) - E_1\nabla^{a_\circ}_t\mathbf{v}_{\circ,s} - E_2\nabla^{a_\circ}_t\nabla^{a_\circ}_s\xi_\circ; \\
L_u\nabla^a_s\eta = {} & \nabla^a_s \mathbf{v}_s + \nabla_{\mathfrak{X}_\eta}\mathfrak{X}_\eta - 2\nabla_{\mathbf{v}_s}\mathfrak{X}_\eta - E_{11}(\mathbf{v}_{\circ,s},\mathbf{v}_{\circ,s}) - E_{12}(\mathbf{v}_{\circ,s},\nabla^{a_\circ}_s\xi) \\
& - E_{21}(\nabla^{a_\circ}_s\xi,\mathbf{v}_{\circ,s}) - E_{22}(\nabla^{a_\circ}_s\xi,\nabla^{a_\circ}_s\xi) - E_1\nabla^{a_\circ}_s\mathbf{v}_{\circ,s} - E_2\nabla^{a_\circ}_s\nabla^{a_\circ}_s\xi.
\end{aligned}$$

References

[1] Nathaniel Bottman and Katrin Wehrheim, *Gromov compactness for squiggly strip shrinking in pseudoholomorphic quilts*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1503.03486.

[2] Kai Cieliebak, Ana Gaio, Ignasi Mundet i Riera, and Dietmar Salamon, *The symplectic vortex equations and invariants of Hamiltonian group actions*, Journal of Symplectic Geometry **1** (2002), no. 3, 543–645.

[3] Kai Cieliebak, Ana Gaio, and Dietmar Salamon, *J-holomorphic curves, moment maps, and invariants of Hamiltonian group actions*, International Mathematical Research Notices **16** (2000), 831–882.

[4] Kai Cieliebak and Klaus Mohnke, *Symplectic hypersurfaces and transversality in Gromov-Witten theory*, Journal of Symplectic Geometry **5** (2007), 281–356.

[5] Urs Frauenfelder, *Floer homology of symplectic quotients and the Arnold-Givental conjecture*, Ph.D. thesis, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, 2004.

[6] Ana Gaio and Dietmar Salamon, *Gromov-Witten invariants of symplectic quotients and adiabatic limits*, Journal of Symplectic Geometry **3** (2005), no. 1, 55–159.

[7] Arthur Jaffe and Clifford Taubes, *Vortices and monopoles*, Progress in Physics, no. 2, Birkhäuser, 1980.

[8] Dusa McDuff and Dietmar Salamon, *J-holomorphic curves and symplectic topology*, Colloquium Publications, vol. 52, American Mathematical Society, 2004.

[9] Ignasi Mundet i Riera, *Yang-Mills-Higgs theory for symplectic fibrations*, Ph.D. thesis, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1999.

[10] ———, *Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants*, Topology **43** (2003), no. 3, 525–553.

[11] Ignasi Mundet i Riera and Gang Tian, *Hamiltonian Gromov-Witten invariants and Hamiltonian quantum product*, In preparation.

[12] Khoa Lu Nguyen, Chris Woodward, and Fabian Ziltener, *Morphisms of CohFT algebras and quantization of the Kirwan map*, Symplectic, Poisson, and Noncommutative Geometry, MSRI Publication, vol. 62, Cambridge University Press, 2014.

[13] Clifford Taubes, *Arbitrary N-vortex solutions to the first order Ginzburg-Landau equations*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **72** (1980), no. 3, 277–292.

[14] Sushimita Venugopalan and Chris Woodward, *Classification of vortices*, Duke Mathematical Journal **165** (2016), 1695–1751.

[15] Sushmita Venugopalan and Guangbo Xu, *Local model for the moduli space of affine vortices*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.06713.

[16] Dongning Wang and Guangbo Xu, *A compactification of the moduli space of disk vortices in adiabatic limit*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **to appear** (2016), http://arxiv.org/abs/1505.05945.

[17] Katrin Wehrheim, *Energy identity for anti-self-dual instantons on* $\mathbb{C} \times \Sigma$, Mathematical Research Letters **13** (2006), 161–166.

[18] Katrin Wehrheim and Chris Woodward, *Floer cohomology and geometric composition of Lagrangian correspondences*, Advances in Mathematics **230** (2012), 177–228.

[19] ———, *Pseudoholomorphic quilts*, Journal of Symplectic Geometry **13** (2015), 849–904.

[20] Chris Woodward, *Gauged Floer theory for toric moment fibers*, Geometric and Functional Analysis **21** (2011), 680–749.

[21] ———, *Quantum Kirwan morphism and Gromov-Witten invariants of quotients I, II, III*, Transformation Groups **20** (2015), 507–556, 881–920, 1155–1193.

[22] Chris Woodward and Guangbo Xu, *Open quantum Kirwan map*, in preparation.

[23] Guangbo Xu, *Moduli space of twisted holomorphic maps with Lagrangian boundary condition: compactness*, Advances in Mathematics **242** (2013), 1–49.

[24] ———, *Classification of* $U(1)$*-vortices with target* $\mathbb{C}^N$, International Journal of Mathematics **26** (2015), no. 13, 1550129 (20 pages).

[25] ———, *Gauged Hamiltonian Floer homology I: definition of the Floer homology groups*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **368** (2016), 2967–3015.

[26] Fabian Ziltener, *Symplectic vortices on the complex plane and quantum cohomology*, Ph.D. thesis, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, 2005.

[27] ———, *The invariant symplectic action and decay for vortices*, Journal of Symplectic Geometry **7** (2009), no. 3, 357–376.

[28] ———, *A quantum Kirwan map: bubbling and Fredholm theory*, Memiors of the American Mathematical Society **230** (2014), no. 1082, 1–129.

Department of Mathematics, Princeton University, Fine Hall, Washington Road, Princeton, NJ 08544 USA

E-mail address: guangbox@math.princeton.edu